INDEX

TO THE

REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

ARTIZANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS IMPROVEMENT.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed,*
2 *August* 1881.

[*Price* 9 *d.*]

358.

H.—17. 1. 82. *Under* 8 *oz.*

REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

ARTIZANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS;

TOGETHER WITH THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed*,
19 *June* 1882.

Ordered, [*Monday*, 20*th February* 1882]:—That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the working of the "Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875," and the amending Act of 1879, with a view of considering how the expense of and the delay and difficulty in carrying out these Acts may be reduced, and also of inquiring into any causes which may have prevented the reconstruction of Dwellings for the Artizan Class to the full extent contemplated and authorised by these Acts, and of recommending such Amendments as may be most expedient for carrying out the full intention of these Acts, and also to consider the working of the Metropolitan Streets Improvement Acts, 1872 and 1877, and of 31 & 32 Vict. c. 130, and 42 & 43 Vict. c. 64.

That the Committee do consist of Nineteen Members.

Committee nominated of—

Mr. Arthur Balfour.	Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Brodrick.	Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Bryce.	Mr. Leamy.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Cropper.	Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Sir Richard Cross.	Mr. Rankin.
Viscount Emlyn.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Hastings.	Mr. Torrens.
Sir Henry Holland.	Sir Sydney Waterlow.

That Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

That the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

That the Minutes of the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, in Session 1881, be referred to the Committee.

Ordered,—[*Tuesday*, 21*st February* 1882]:—That Mr. Justin M'Carthy be added to the Committee.

REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE - - - - - p. xiv
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 195

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed "to consider the working of 'The Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875,' and the amending Act of 1879, with a view of considering how the expense of and the delay and difficulty in carrying out these Acts may be reduced, and also of inquiring into any causes which may have prevented the reconstruction of dwellings for the Artizan Class to the full extent contemplated and authorised by these Acts, and of recommending such Amendments as may be most expedient for carrying out the full intention of these Acts, and also to consider the working of the Metropolitan Streets Improvement Acts, 1872 and 1877, and of 31 & 32 Vict. c. 130, and 42 & 43 Vict. c. 64";——Have agreed to the following REPORT:—

Your Committee were unable last Session to complete taking the evidence upon the matters referred to them, but they presented an Interim Report, in which suggestions were made in the direction of enlarging the discretion of the confirming authority and of justifying a liberal interpretation of the powers vested in that authority. They have reason to believe that some of these suggestions have since been acted upon with advantage.

Your Committee have examined many of the medical officers of the several districts in the Metropolis, and other persons well acquainted with the more densely populated parts of it, as also the representatives of the London Trades Council, and other working men; and they have themselves visited many of the areas reported as unhealthy under the Act of 1875. They are of opinion that the condition of such areas fully brings them within the terms of the Preamble and the third section of that Act: and that it is necessary for the public health that many of such houses, courts, and alleys, should be removed, and that some provision should be made for rebuilding dwellings for a certain portion of the working classes who may be so displaced.

Your Committee are of opinion that nothing will contribute more to the social, moral, and physical improvement of these classes than the improvement of the houses and places in which they live. In carrying out such improvements they believe that there is ample room for the operation of all existing agencies. Sir Richard Cross' Acts, 1875—1879, Mr. Torrens' Acts, 1868—1879, The Public Health and other Sanitary and Local Acts, as well as for private enterprise.

It may be useful here to call attention to the principles upon which the chief Acts relating to Artizans' Dwellings are based, and to state shortly the law upon the subject.

The objects of the Bill of 1867-8, as originally brought in by Mr. Torrens, were to make provision, *first*, for taking down or improving dwellings occupied by working men which were unfit for human habitation, and *secondly*, for the building and maintenance of better dwellings instead; but the Act of 1868 retained the former class of provisions only, the latter having been struck out of the Bill during its progress through Parliament. Under these provisions, on the report of the officer of health that any inhabited building is in a condition dangerous to health, so as to be unfit for human habitation, the local authority (*i. e.*, the vestry or district board in the Metropolis, exclusive of the City of London), after ascertaining from their surveyor that the causes of the evil can be remedied by structural alterations, or that the premises ought to be demolished, have power respectively to order the owner to remove

Bill No. 1, Nov. 1867.

31 & 32 Vict. c. 130. Preamble.

the premises, and in default, themselves to remove them; or they may order the owner to execute the necessary structural alterations, and in default, may either shut up or pull down the premises, or themselves execute the necessary work at the owner's expense. The amending Act of 1879 restored the provisions as to rebuilding, nearly as they were found in the Bill as originally brought in, and gave such owner power to require the local authority to purchase the premises, in which case the local authority is to hold such property upon trust primarily, so far as the Metropolis is concerned; *first*, for the providing, by the construction of new buildings, or the repairing or improvement of existing buildings, the labouring classes with suitable dwellings; *secondly*, for the opening out of closed or partially closed alleys or courts inhabited by the labouring classes, and the widening of the same by pulling down any building, or otherwise leaving such open spaces as may be necessary to make such alleys or courts healthful. The power of enforcing the duty of carrying out the provisions of these Acts in the Metropolis vests in the Metropolitan Board.

42 & 43 Vict. c. 64.

38 & 39 Vict. c. 36. Preamble.

The object of the Act of 1875 was to meet a different class of cases. The Preamble of the Act states that in many towns large areas are so built, and the buildings within them are so densely inhabited as to be highly injurious to the moral and physical welfare of the inhabitants; and in such areas a great number of houses, courts, and alleys, from want of light, air, ventilation, and proper conveniences, are unfit for human habitation; and fever and disease are constantly generated, thus causing death and loss of health not only in such places themselves, but also elsewhere; and owing to the fact that such places are the property of several owners, and that it is not in the power of any one owner to make the necessary alterations, it is necessary that such areas should be wholly reconstructed, due provision being made for dwellings for the working classes who may be displaced; and by this Act the duty is laid in the first instance on the local authority, on the report of the Medical Officer of Health, to make an improvement scheme for the rearrangement and reconstruction of the streets and houses within such area, taken as a whole. (The local authority being in this case in the City of London, the Commissioners of Sewers, and in the rest of the Metropolis, the Metropolitan Board; and in an urban sanitary district, the urban sanitary authority).

Sect. 3.

Sect. 2.

Sect 5.

In such improvement scheme, the local authority may include even neighbouring lands, if necessary, for making the scheme efficient for sanitary purposes, or for widening the approaches for the purposes of ventilation and health; and by such scheme they are bound to provide for the accommodation of at the least as many persons of the working classes as may be displaced, in suitable dwellings within the limits, or in the vicinity of the area, or, as provided by the Amending Act of 1879, in some other place where equally convenient accommodation can be provided. Such scheme after receiving the approval of the Secretary of State or the Local Government Board as the confirming authority, and after confirmation of a Provisional Order by Parliament, is to be carried out by the local authority. And the duty is laid upon them to purchase the necessary lands, and they have full power to sell or let for the purpose of rebuilding according to the scheme. There is, however, no power of enforcing their duties in these respects provided by the Act, but on failure by the local authority to sell or let the land for these purposes within five years after the removal of the buildings, the confirming authority may sell the land by auction, subject to the conditions imposed by the scheme.

42 & 43 Vict. c. 63.

Sect. 6.

Sect. 9.

Sect. 10.

The Acts of 1868–79 proceed upon the principle that the responsibility of maintaining his houses in proper condition falls upon the owner, and that if he fails in his duty the law is justified in stepping in and compelling him to perform it. They further assume that houses unfit for human habitation ought not to be used as dwellings, but ought, in the interests of the public, to be closed and demolished, and to be subsequently rebuilt. The expropriation of the owner is thus a secondary step in the transaction, and only takes place after the failure of other means of rendering the houses habitable.

The Acts of 1875–79 proceed upon a different principle. They contemplate dealing with whole areas, where the houses are so structurally defective

defective as to be incapable of repair, and so ill placed with reference to each other as to require, to bring them up to a proper sanitary standard, nothing short of demolition and reconstruction. Accordingly, in this case, the local authority, armed with compulsory powers, at once enters as a purchaser, and on completion of the purchase proceeds forthwith to a scheme of reconstruction. Though these two sets of Acts proceed upon different principles, they are each of them available for their own particular purpose, and are both, in the opinion of your Committee, alike necessary and useful.

A.—As to the Acts of 1875—1879 (Sir R. A. Cross' Acts).

Full particulars as to the extent to which these Acts have been carried out in London and elsewhere will be found in the Parliamentary Paper, No. 41, 1881, and in the Appendix to this Report.

The 14 areas already dealt with by the Metropolitan Board have an extent of about 42 acres. They were inhabited by 20,335 persons, in 5,555 separate holdings; 3,349 of which holdings consisted of one room only, 1,483 of two rooms, 723 of three or more rooms. They were acquired under the compulsory powers of the Act of 1875, at the gross cost of 1,661,372 *l.*, including legal expenses and formation of new streets; but as the land comprised in the Little Coram-street and the Great Peter-street schemes was bought up and cleared by the Peabody Trustees, at a cost of 80,036 *l.*, the Metropolitan Board contributing the further sum of 10,000 *l.*, the ultimate gross cost amounted to 1,581,336 *l.* About nine acres of the 42 have been devoted to new streets, at a cost of 95,500 *l.*, which is included in the above amount.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Acts, 1876–9.

Report of Metropolitan Board, 974***.

Appendix No. 3, 1882.

Owing to the obligations imposed by the Act of 1875, of providing accommodation for *at the least as many* persons of the working classes as may be displaced, it has been possible to reserve but a small portion of the areas thus cleared for commercial purposes, say between two-and-a-half and three acres, estimated to realise 109,000 *l.*

Appendix No. 2, 1882.

Six sites were first sold to the Peabody Trustees, 68,299 feet at Whitechapel for 10,000 *l.*, being nearly 3 *s.* per foot, and the rest at 5 *s.* per foot. Subsequent sales of most of the other sites have been made to the Industrial Dwellings Company and others, principally at the rate of 3 *s.* 4 *d.* per foot. If the land could have been sold free from any conditions as to rebuilding, it would, it is estimated, have realised three times the price for which it was actually sold.

Mr. Vigers, 1881.

Mr. Goddard.

The accommodation to be provided in these 14 areas under the Provisional Orders confirmed by Parliament, was to be for 22,753 persons, in 6,206 separate holdings, 1,535 of which holdings were to consist of one room only, 3,849 of two rooms, and 822 of three rooms or more. Your Committee have reason to believe that the actual accommodation provided will be in excess of the number stipulated.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Acts, 1876–9.

The estimated amount to be received for recoupment by sale of land is about 370,000 *l.*, which would leave the net loss to the Metropolitan Board from the whole transaction at 1,211,336 *l.*, being about 76 per cent. of the gross cost, or at 1,115,836 *l.*, being about 70·6 per cent. of the gross cost, according as the cost of new streets is or is not included in the calculation. A large proportion of the difference between the cost and the recoupment, which may be fairly estimated as not less than 560,000 *l.*, is due to the obligation to rebuild labourers' dwellings, instead of selling the sites for ordinary purposes.

The areas dealt with were in almost every case cleared, and the persons living in any individual area were dispossessed with such compensation as was awarded to them before any rebuilding commenced. It is stated that very few, if any, of the families thus dispossessed returned for the purpose of occupying the new buildings; and in one case where a block built by the Peabody Trustees on an adjoining site was available for the persons dispossessed, and holdings were offered to them, very few accepted them. The buildings of the Peabody Trustees appear to be somewhat beyond the means, and unsuited to the wants and special callings, of the poorer class of persons occupying areas with which it has been found necessary to deal under the Act of 1875.

3008. 1881.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Act, 1877, ch. c.

The Corporation of London were exempted from the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board in respect of the provisions of the Act of 1875 upon an understanding with the Home Secretary that they would act promptly under the Act within their own district. They proceeded at once with two schemes, in respect of Petticoat Square and Golden Lane. They cleared these two sites without the consent of the Home Secretary at a cost of 240,000 *l.*, and they dispossessed by the clearance 1,734 persons, in 495 separate holdings and 1,010 rooms. The extent of the areas cleared, including the public ways then existing, amounted to 133,000 feet, or, deducting such public ways, to 111,000 feet, owing to the proposed re-arrangement and to the enlargement of streets, &c., the land available for building amounted only to 74,000 feet, on which it was proposed to re-house 1,783 persons, in 473 separate holdings and in 1,026 rooms. These sites have practically remained undealt with for about three years, as the Corporation have been unwilling to realise the great loss which would result from selling the land so cleared, subject to the condition of rebuilding labourers' dwellings. The best offers they have received for the land, subject to such conditions, has been for 1,250*l.* per annum for the two areas. It is alleged that the market value of these sites for commercial purposes, after deducting the land required for new streets, would be 7,500 *l.* per annum, or six times the amount for which they would sell subject to the restrictions of the Act; the difference would represent 150 *l.* per room over and above the cost of the new buildings and of their site. As in the case of the areas in the Metropolitan Districts, the persons formerly occupying these sites are dispersed, and probably but few of the individuals displaced would return to occupy the buildings which would be built under the Act of 1875. In the case of two other schemes which the Corporation of London contemplated dealing with, they have been anticipated by the owners or other persons clearing the areas of the unhealthy houses without replacing them with other buildings for their inhabitants.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Act, 1877.

The census returns of the City of London for the last 30 or 40 years show that the labouring population within its boundaries has been greatly reduced by the substitution of warehouses and offices for buildings suitable for the working people, in consequence of the enormous increase in the value of land. The number of inhabited houses in the City has been reduced from 14,580 in 1851 to 6,493 in 1881, and the population from 127,869 to 50,526.

75-680. 1882.

The difficulty in carrying out the provisions of these Acts obviously arises from the great cost of doing so. But there are other matters which should be mentioned as bearing upon the question of cost, such as the additional rateable value of the new buildings, as compared with that of the old buildings, *e. g.*, the rateable value of the new buildings of the Peabody Trustees, on the six sites sold to them, will amount to 13,311 *l.*, as against the ratcable value of the old premises on those sites of 9,986 *l.* And the ratepayers will no doubt reap advantage in the future (as pointed out by the Rev. S. A. Barnett, the Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, and an experienced poor law guardian) from the improved health and morals of the people, and consequent decrease of burden on the rates, for "preventable sickness is the most costly of all things."

4373-4. 1881.

3215. 1882.

Parliamentary Paper [c. 1143], 1875.

Still the problem is how to reduce the cost so far as can wisely be done, while at the same time giving full effect to the intention and spirit of the Acts.

The sources of cost are mainly three in number—

1st. The amount of compensation given.

2nd. The expense of procedure, including law charges.

3rd. The obligation to sell or relet for rebuilding artizans' dwellings.

As to the First Source of Cost.

The intention of the Acts was clearly to guard against any excessive valuation of the property itself.

38 & 39 Vict. c. 36. s. 19.

The estimate of the value of lands within the unhealthy area was to be based upon the fair market value, such value to be calculated—

"1st. *As estimated at the time of the valuation being made*" (so as to exclude

exclude improvements made for the purpose of increasing the amount of compensation).

2nd. "*Due regard being had to the nature and 'then' condition of the property, and the probable duration of the buildings in their existing state, and to the state of the repair thereof, and all circumstances affecting such value.*"

3rd. "*Without any additional allowance in respect of compulsory purchase.*"

Subsequent provisions were made by the Amending Act of 1879, to prevent an owner from taking advantage of his own wrong through the unhealthy state of the premises, or by reason of overcrowding. 42 & 43 Vict. c. 63, s. 3.

Your Committee find that some difficulty has arisen from the words in section 3 of the Act of 1875, "due regard being had to *all circumstances affecting such value*" (which were inserted at the instance of the late Mr. Cawley in Committee), as appearing to grant what has been called "a valuation of contingent probabilities;" they think that under these words the valuation has, in some cases, been too high, and they recommend that they should be left out by future legislation. 548–9. 1882.

It has also been suggested that in the first instance the houses practically unfit for habitation should be placed in a category by themselves. Your Committee are of opinion that the character of the houses must necessarily differ much in the various areas, even in the unhealthy parts of such areas, and that it is better to leave the matter in the hands of the arbitrator, for him to deal with each property separately on its individual merits. 518. 1882. 330–1. 1882. 482. 1882.

Sir Henry Hunt, one of the arbitrators under the Act, has told your Committee that if a house is in a dilapidated condition, and it would be waste of money to repair it, he should calculate the value upon the principle of what the land is worth and the materials, and that he should let the claimant have that, and no more. Mr. Rodwell, another of the arbitrators, has told your Committee that in valuing such land, he should only value it as subject to the evil surroundings in which it was there placed, and not as situated in a cleared space. Your Committee are clearly of opinion that these principles thus laid down are in conformity with the spirit and intention of the Acts, and should guide all future arbitration in this matter. 227. 1882. 331. 1882. 4484–5. 1881 4276–9. 1881. 548. 1882.

The question of compensation for trade profit is a more difficult matter to deal with. It has been doubted whether in strictness of law the Act contemplated any compensation for trade profit at all. It is difficult, however, to contest the conclusion of Sir H. Hunt and Mr. Rodwell, that where the business is connected with any particular holding, the occupier is entitled to moderate compensation; but your Committee are of opinion that the arbitrator should in all such cases consider well whether the trader has not the opportunity of setting up his trade somewhere in the immediate neighbourhood without positive injury, in which case he would clearly be entitled only to proper expenses connected with removal. 220. 1882. 351–2. 1882. 4904–6. 1881.

There still remains the question of weekly tenants. Your Committee find that upon this point the several arbitrators have proceeded on somewhat different principles. 233. 1882. 4895. 1881.

Sir H. Hunt, with the concurrence of the Corporation of Liverpool, has been in the habit of giving 1 *l.* a year for every year that a tenant has been in occupation, not exceeding, however, in any one case the sum of 15 *l.* Mr. Rodwell, on the other hand, lets each case stand on its own merits. When there were little businesses such as laundries, cobbler's work, &c., he gave somewhat more than a simple sum for removal, whereas when a man was simply a weekly tenant of a house, he gave him 20 *s.* or 2 *l.* to enable him to pay for removal and finding a holding somewhere else. Your Committee are disposed to approve of the principle followed by Mr. Rodwell.

Your Committee find that the whole amount of compensation thus awarded to weekly tenants forms only a small item in the ultimate cost, and that it is reasonable to give a fair compensation, and advantageous to the local authority to give an inducement to remove rather than to be obliged to resort 3055. 1882.

to legal proceedings to enforce removal. But they are strongly of opinion that no money payment should be made till actual removal takes place, and they attach great value to any assistance which the local authority may render in finding accommodation elsewhere for the persons so displaced.

As to the Second Source of Cost.

3454, &c. 1882. The machinery for estimating compensation under these Acts appears to be far more economical and more speedy than that provided by the Lands Clauses Acts, but your Committee think that it may be still further simplified with advantage. Both Sir H. Hunt and Mr. Rodwell are agreed that the provisional award should be dispensed with, and that this would cause saving both in expense and in time. In this view the town clerk of Liverpool, who approved warmly of the machinery of the Acts, as compared with that of the Lands Clauses Acts, entirely agrees, and your Committee recommend that it should be carried out at once.

410. 1882.
4919. 1881.
3465–6. 1882.

188. 1882. On the question of costs, your Committee are of opinion that with a view to saving expense, the salary or remuneration, travelling and other expenses of the arbitrator should be certified by the confirming authority before payment by the local authority, and that the 29th paragraph of the Schedule to the Act of 1875 should be amended so as to make it quite clear that the arbitrator has the power to refuse to give costs, if he thinks the case one in which no costs ought to be given.

4932, &c. 1881.
422, &c. 1882.

4928–9. 1881.
649. 1882.
335. 1882. It has also been pointed out with great force that in order to prevent exaggerated claims, some period should be fixed, after which no person should be entitled to recover or claim compensation for any alteration in term or tenure, or for any improvements in the property, unless made compulsorily for sanitary purposes.

Your Committee are entirely of this opinion. Whether this period should be the publication by the local authority of the advertisement stating the fact of a scheme having been made, or the making of the Provisional Order by the confirming authority is a question for consideration, but your Committee would recommend the earlier date.

38 & 39 Vict. c. 36 s. 6.

38 & 39 Vict. Schedule, par. 26. Your Committee are also of opinion that the appeal to a jury in matters of compensation, which is now allowed when the amount in dispute exceeds 500 *l.*, should not be allowed except in those cases where the amount exceeds 1,000 *l.*

As to the Third Source of Cost.

Your Committee consider that there is a great difference between the condition of the Metropolis and provincial towns. The element of cost under this head arises from the use of land in central positions, and therefore of great value for commercial purposes for such comparatively unremunerative purposes as artizans' dwellings. The Amending Act of 1879, which provides that other lands equally suitable might be used in lieu of the actual sites cleared, went far to meet the difficulty, but unfortunately almost all the schemes adopted under the Acts were framed before the Amending Act came into force.

In the provincial towns there does not seem to be the necessity for insisting on the rebuilding of houses for the classes displaced; and your Committee are of opinion that, as a rule, and from natural causes and the general process of building, equally convenient accommodation can be and is, generally speaking, provided for the persons of the working class displaced by any scheme at some place other than within or in the immediate vicinity of the area comprised in the scheme. The experience of Edinburgh and Glasgow points to this conclusion, and the action of the Local Government Board, in relieving the Corporation of Liverpool from selling or leasing the area taken for rebuilding artizans' dwellings confirms them in this opinion.

Parliamentary Paper, c. 1143. 1875.
3481–7. 1882.

Your

Your Committee recommend that in the case of provincial towns, except in such special cases as may appear to the confirming authority to require a provision, for the rehousing of the working classes to be displaced, or some of them, on or near the area dealt with, the local authority should be relieved of this obligation, and that the Act of 1875 should be amended accordingly.

In the Metropolis, on the contrary, very great hardship would often follow if the provisions for replacement in or near the area of displacement were wholly done away with. The special calling of many of the workpeople, the hours of their work, the employment of their children, the maintenance of their home life, the economy of living together in a family, the cheapness of food owing to the nearness of the great evening markets, &c., render it very desirable that a large portion should be enabled to rehouse themselves in or near their old places of living; and if no fresh dwellings be provided, the evils of overcrowding will at once increase. The evidence of the medical officers, of Mr. Rodwell, Canon Gilbert, the Rev. S. A. Barnett, the working men themselves, Miss Octavia Hill, the Hon. Miss Stanley, and others, is conclusive on this point. 1740. 1882.

Still it is equally true that these observations do not apply to the whole of the population to be displaced. Many without any special calling may live in one place as well as in another. The facilities of transit recently offered by cheap trains, by boats, by tramways, &c., have enabled many to live in the suburbs and elsewhere, who can do so consistently with their calling. It must also be observed that in this respect the circumstances of some parts of the Metropolis differ much from those of other parts; it would therefore be impossible to lay down safely any hard-and-fast line for the whole of the metropolis.

Your Committee, on the whole, are of opinion that the existing law, which requires that "the improvement scheme shall provide for the accommodation of *at the least* as many persons of the working class as may be displaced," may be relaxed, and that the accommodation to be required should vary from one-half to two-thirds, as the confirming authority may think fit, on the report of the person holding the local inquiry in such case on their behalf. 38 & 39 Vict. c. 36, s. 5.

The effect of this relaxation will be not merely greatly to reduce the cost, but it will in many cases enable the Metropolitan Board in dealing with an unhealthy area to refrain from pulling down the whole number of the houses, at all events at once, in cases when they may be able to render parts of the area sufficiently healthy by pulling down certain houses only, and so letting in light and air and giving ventilation to the remaining parts. As a fair example of this, your Committee are of opinion that one of the schemes under the consideration of the Metropolitan Board, which they visited and which was situated near the river at Wapping, might in part be so treated with advantage, a plan of proceeding which was of course impracticable when the whole number displaced had to be rehoused.

With regard to the City of London itself, your Committee are of opinion that in some respects it stands upon an exceptional footing, owing to the very exceptional value of land within its limits; and they are of opinion as regards the schemes affecting the City, that it is especially in such cases that the confirming authority would be well advised in giving full scope to the provisions of the amending Act of 1879, under which the accommodation to be provided may be provided elsewhere, and within some reasonable and suitable distance. In this case of course the existence of accommodation for transit by railway, boat, or tramway, would form an important element in considering what was a reasonable and suitable distance. In respect of the two sites already cleared by the Corporation of London, in Petticoat-square and Golden-lane, as to which the persons who formerly lived there have long since been dispossessed, your Committee are of opinion that it would not be wise to insist upon the re-construction of artizans' dwellings at the cost indicated for the whole of the population displaced. They think that the Corporation should be relieved of the obligation in respect of one half of the number of persons for whom provision was to be made under the schemes, on condition of their promptly fulfilling their obligation as to the other half of the population displaced under the provisions of the Acts of 1875 and 1879.

It is of almost equal importance that such accommodation as is required should be provided *speedily:* To effect this it may be desirable that the work be carried out in sections—that the conditions of sale or lease be as simple as possible—that the greatest facilities be given to the buyers or leaseholders to lay out the ground as they may think best, subject only to the condition that the actual object of the Act itself be strictly complied with. In many cases the lower story may be well devoted to shops, with convenient rooms attached on the next story or elsewhere for the accommodation of those who keep the shops; but in such cases there should be a separate entrance to the dwellings for artizans entirely distinct from the entrance to the shop. In many cases it may be necessary to provide special accommodation for the requirements of the particular business of the persons displaced, such as costermongers, &c.; this would come under the meaning of the term "*suitable dwellings*," which will be found in the fifth section of the Act of 1875; in many cases it would be well to have a larger number of single rooms than have hitherto been provided, so as to suit the wants of the poorer class; in many it would be well to have playgrounds for children on the top of the roof or on the ground below, such as are to be found in the case of many of the improved dwellings already built.

Your Committee are of opinion that the Peabody Trustees, who may fairly be considered as a *quasi* public body, should specially undertake the duty of supplying the wants of the poorer class of the persons displaced. Your Committee, therefore, hope that the Peabody Trustees may find it consistent with the provisions of their trust in any additional buildings which they may erect to make provisions suited to the means and to the wants and special callings of a poorer class than that for which they have hitherto provided.

In connection with this subject your Committee would call attention to the importance of favouring in every way facilities of transit between the great centres of industry and the outlying districts, and especially between the metropolis and its suburbs. Owing to economic causes land in the central parts of London is, generally speaking, becoming too valuable to be easily made use of as sites for dwellings for the working classes, and property of this kind, including areas scheduled under these Acts, is being constantly bought up and converted to other purposes. Side by side with this movement there is a large migration of the working classes to the suburbs, where in some places private enterprise is busy erecting tenements and providing cheap means of locomotion. The question of the condition of this suburban population, whose employment lies in London, has necessarily occupied the attention of your Committee, and induced them to make the following recommendations:

1388, &c. 1882. 1st. That similar conditions as to workmen's trains within a certain distance from London to those now imposed upon the Great Eastern Railway Company should be enforced in the case of other Railways as opportunities may offer. Such an opportunity has just offered in the case of the Regent's Canal Bill. They have strongly recommended this Bill to the notice of the Board of Trade, in consequence of which proper clauses will be inserted on their suggestion.

1903, &c. 1882. 2nd. That many of the sanitary provisions of the Metropolitan Building Acts be at once extended to the suburbs, under the control of the several local authorities.

3rd. That all existing sanitary legislation should be more fully enforced, especially in those parts of the suburbs where buildings are so rapidly springing up.

B.—As to the Acts of 1868-1879 (Mr. Torrens' Acts).

The Act of 1868 was, as has already been pointed out, considerably altered in its passage through Parliament, but, though limited in its scope, it proved of great value, and up to 1875 was not unfrequently put in force by certain Vestries and Local Boards. In 1879 an amending Act was passed, but as action has rarely been taken under it, owing to the prevalent misapprehension that an alternative method was in *all* cases offered by Sir R. Cross's Act of 1875, your Committee have no sufficient means of reporting as to its working.

1225, &c. 1881.
1754, &c. 1882.

Your

Your Committee regard these provisions as most useful, and regret that they have not been more constantly and universally put in force. They would strongly urge upon the Vestries and District Boards the necessity of putting them fully in force without delay.

Your Committee reported last Session that, in their opinion, with a view to doing so, immediate attention should be given by the Vestries and Boards to those areas which the medical officer had reported to the Metropolitan Board as unhealthy areas, but which the Metropolitan Board had not included in any scheme under the Act of 1875, on the ground of the smallness of such areas. They would again press this point strongly upon the notice of the several vestries and district boards.

The intention of Parliament in sanctioning these statutes was to provide the means whereby local authorities might secure the effectual repair of dilapidated dwellings, or when necessary their gradual reconstruction. As the work of bit-by-bit replacement can never cease to be an object of municipal care in over-peopled localities, it was hoped that it would come to be regarded as a constantly recurring duty which, if performed with discrimination, would lead to the permanent improvement and rateable capability of a district, without aggravating in the process the evils of over-crowding. The scope of these Acts may with advantage be distinguished from that of the Statutes of 1875–9, with which it is not expedient that it should be liable to be confounded. There is ample evidence to show that a vestry or district board has frequently deferred taking action in the matter, misled by a hope that the Metropolitan Board might undertake the rebuilding of an unhealthy court or a block of decayed houses as a portion of some general scheme. It is important that such illusory and injurious expectations should be set aside. 467–480. 1881.

Your Committee are of opinion that these Acts may be materially improved by allowing the local authority to remove houses, though in themselves in good condition, when by doing so they could open up courts and alleys, and so give the necessary air, light, and ventilation, so as to render such courts or alleys healthy; in which case the owner would be entitled to full compensation, just as much as the owner of premises taken under the 5th section of the Act of 1875 for widening existing approaches to unhealthy areas. In such cases your Committee think that any additional value accruing in consequence to houses adjoining the house so pulled down, should, when they belong to the same owner, be taken into consideration in assessing compensation.

Your Committee think that the operation of these Acts should not be confined to individual premises, but should be extended to several houses in a street, court, or alley, within the limits of what may be called a mere local, as opposed to a metropolitan improvement. There can be no doubt (as already suggested) that one reason why these Acts have not been more generally enforced, especially since the passing of the Act of 1875, has been the desire of the local authorities to avoid the expense falling on the local district, and the hope that the matter would be dealt with by the Metropolitan Board out of the metropolitan rates. The only power to enforce the operation of these Acts rests in the Metropolitan Board, under the 12th section of the Act of 1879. This provision has never yet been put in force, and it is in evidence that no application has ever been made to the Board to act upon it. It is not within the province of your Committee to enter upon the question of the government of London; but so long as matters remain in their present condition, they would suggest that in case of neglect by the local authority to act on the representations of the medical officer, the board of guardians, or any owner of property in the immediate neighbourhood, should have power to report the matter to the Metropolitan Board of Works, with a view to their taking action under the 12th section. 775–9. 1881 5625, &c. 1881.

C.—As to the Metropolitan Street Improvement Acts, 1872, 1877.

It is not necessary to enter upon the consideration of the provisions of the Act of 1872, as all the places to which that Act applies have been already dealt with by the Metropolitan Board, and no complaint now arises for further consideration. 1574–5. 1882.

40 & 41 Vict. c. 235, s. 33.

But the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 does present serious difficulties. This section, after reciting that the making of the street improvements involves the removal of many houses, and that it is expedient that provision be made for the accommodation of such of the labouring classes as will be displaced by such removal, enacts that the Board in carrying into effect the provisions of the Act shall, for the purpose of providing such accommodation, acquire or appropriate so much of certain specified lands, or such other lands as a Secretary of State shall deem sufficient; and shall, as soon as may be, sell or let the same for the purpose of the erection or adaptation and continuance thereupon of suitable dwelling-houses or lodging-houses for persons of the labouring classes, and it also enacts that before the Board shall, without the consent of a Secretary of State, take for the purposes of the Act fifteen houses or more occupied at the time of the passing of the Act, either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, the Board shall prove to the satisfaction of such Secretary of State that sufficient accommodation in suitable dwellings has been provided elsewhere upon such lands for the same number of persons.

1580, &c. 1882.

Under these provisions two great difficulties have arisen.

1st. As to the restriction against taking down more than 15 houses at any one time.

2nd. As to the appropriating land for the purpose of providing accommodation for the whole of the labouring classes to be displaced.

Your Committee are of opinion that certain relaxations of this Act are necessary in the public interest—

1st. As to the number of houses that may be removed at any time.

2nd. As to the necessity of rebuilding to the extent provided by the Act.

Two schemes under the Act have been especially brought under the notice of your Committee by the Metropolitan Board.

40 & 41 Vic. c. 235, s. 4.

1st. The West End New Streets and Street Improvements.

3678. 1882.

By this scheme 5,300 of such persons were liable to be displaced within the limits of deviation.

3705. 1882.

3679. 1882.

The Metropolitan Board, however, do not intend to take the whole area comprised within the limits of deviation, and are content to surrender their power to an extent which would reduce this number to 4,000 only, and they propose to provide accommodation for one-half of this number as follows :—

1st. They have reserved accommodation for more than 600 on the site in Old Pye Street, Westminster, already dealt with under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act of 1875. This accommodation has been provided in excess of the accommodation required under that Act, and for the express purpose of accommodating persons to be displaced under the improvement scheme now under consideration.

1581, &c. 1882.

3675. 1882.

Secondly. They are ready and willing to clear the plots coloured blue on the plan presented to your Committee, and marked No. 1 and No. 2 respectively, which have both been set apart for this purpose, and to let or sell these plots for this purpose without delay. This plan will afford further accommodation for 1,470 persons. As soon as these two plots have been built over, but not before, they desire to go on with the rest of the improvement scheme as they may find expedient, relieved of the obligations of the 33rd Section above alluded to.

Your Committee assent to this proposal, and think that it ought to be carried out at once.

2nd. Gray's Inn-road Improvement.

3622, &c. 1882.

By this scheme 1,930 persons of the working class are liable to be displaced. Out of this number the persons in fixed employment within one mile radius of Baldwin's-gardens, Gray's Inn-road, amount to 1,155.

The

The Metropolitan Board propose that the part coloured pink on the map produced before your Committee should be thrown into Gray's Inn-road; that the whole frontage, coloured yellow, 50 feet in depth, be devoted to commercial purposes; and that the remainder should be devoted to the building of artizans' dwellings, to an extent which would provide accommodation for 1,200 persons.

The work to be completed in three sections:—

1st. The site for artizans' dwellings coloured blue, and lying south of Baldwin's Gardens, and the whole frontage from Holborn to the Town Hall, to be cleared and disposed of. Appendix 14 & 15.

2nd. As soon as the site thus devoted to artizans' dwellings has been built over, but not before, the site for artizans' dwellings coloured green, and lying north of Baldwin's Gardens, to be cleared and disposed of.

3rd. As soon as the site thus also devoted to artizans' dwellings has been built over, but not before, the whole of the rest of the area comprised in the scheme, and lying to the north of Liquorpond Street, to be proceeded with without delay, the part coloured yellow and pink to be devoted to commercial purposes and widening of the street, the part coloured purple to be devoted to artizans' dwellings.

And, subject to these conditions, the Board desire that they should be relieved of the obligations of the 33rd Section, above alluded to.

Your Committee assent to this proposal, and think that it ought to be carried out at once.

In conclusion: your Committee, while fully alive to the necessity of consolidating the whole of the existing Acts, and of dealing with the other matters alluded to above, are of opinion that—

1st. It is desirable that a short Amending Bill of the Acts of 1875-9 should at once be brought into Parliament, and, if possible, passed this Session, to carry out so much of the above recommendations as relates to relaxing the Acts in respect of the number of persons for whom accommodation should be provided in all pending or future schemes in the provincial towns as well as in London, and to the doing away with the necessity for a provisional award, and also as to the period after which no compensation should be given for alteration in term or tenure, or for improvement made. 639, 640. 1882. 4928, 4929. 1881.

2ndly. It is desirable to amend the Act of 1868, and the Amending Act of 1879, as suggested, without delay.

3rdly. It is also desirable to pass an Act for relaxing the provisions of the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act, 1877, on the points above suggested, and this also, in their opinion, ought to be brought before Parliament and passed during the present Session, and they are also of opinion that the same policy ought to be followed in any future Metropolitan Street Improvement Act.

4thly. The Committee hope that, if the recommendations they propose to be carried out this Session obtain the sanction of Parliament, no time should be lost by the Corporation of the City, by the Metropolitan Board Board of Works, by the Vestries, and by the District Boards of Works, in giving effect to these designs for local improvements.

5thly. They would recommend the alteration of the Standing Order, No. 184, so as to carry out the views indicated in this Report, still, however, retaining sufficient safeguards in the interests of the persons to be displaced, in accordance with the general tenour of this Report.

19 *June* 1882.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Monday, 27th February 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Sir Henry Holland.	Viscount Emlyn.
Sir Richard Cross.	

Sir RICHARD CROSS was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Two o'clock.

Thursday, 2nd March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.	Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Justin M'Carthy.	Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Leamy.	Sir Sydney Waterlow.
Viscount Emlyn.	Mr. Torrens.
Mr. Brodrick.	Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.	Sir Matthew Ridley.

Mr. *Edward Eyre-Ashby*, Mr. *Frederick William Goddard*, and Mr. *John Crouch*, were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.

Monday, 6th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. John Hollond.	Sir Sydney Waterlow.
Sir Henry Holland.	Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.	Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Brodrick.	Mr. Torrens.
Sir Matthew Ridley.	Mr. Bryce.
Viscount Emlyn.	

Sir *Henry Arthur Hunt*, C.B., was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at One o'clock.

Thursday, 9th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Richard Cross in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Rankin.
Mr. William Holms.	Mr. Cropper.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.	Viscount Emlyn.
Sir Henry Holland.	Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Brodrick.	

Sir *Henry Arthur Hunt*, C.B., and Mr. *Frederick William Goddard* were further examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.

Monday, 13th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Richard Cross in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. John Hollond.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Rankin.	Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.	Mr. Torrens.
Sir Henry Holland.	Viscount Emlyn.

Mr. *Frederick William Goddard* was further examined.

Mr. *John Grant* and Mr. *Robert Reid* were examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at One o'clock.

Thursday, 16th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Richard Cross in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Torrens.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Rankin.	Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.	Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Cropper.	Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Hastings.	Sir Sydney Waterlow.

Mr. *Samuel Walker* and the Rev. Canon *Gilbert* were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.

Monday, 20*th March* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. William Holms.	Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Rankin.	Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Torrens.	

Mr. *William Birt* was examined.

Mr. *Frederick William Goddard* was further examined.

Dr. *Septimus Gibbon* was examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at one O'clock.

Thursday, 23*rd March* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SIR RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. William Holms.	Mr. Hastings.
Mr. John Hollond.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Rankin.	Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Torrens.	Mr. Arthur Balfour.

Dr. *Septimus Gibbon* was further examined.

Mr. *J. W. Tripe*, M.D., was examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.

Monday, 27*th March* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel Hogg.	Mr. Cropper.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Torrens.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Brodrick.
Sir Henry Holland.	

Mr. *Richard Wm. Keating*, Mr. *Joseph Charles Kirkham*, Mr. *John Field*, and the Rev. *John Rose* were examined.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 30th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Richard Cross in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Torrens.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Rankin.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Brodrick.	Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. Hastings.	Mr. Cropper.
Viscount Emlyn.	

Mr. *Thomas Eckford Powell*, Mr. *Thomas Abrey*, Mr. *Charles Hodson*, Mr. *Alfred Evans*, the Hon. Miss *Maude Stanley*, and Miss *Octavia Hill* were examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.

Monday, 3rd April 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Richard Cross in the Chair.

Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir Henry Holland.	Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Cropper.	Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Torrens.	Mr. Francis Buxton.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	

The Hon. Miss *Maude Stanley* was further examined.

The Rev. *Samuel Augustus Barnett* was examined.

Miss *Octavia Hill* was further examined.

[Adjourned till Monday, 24th April, at One o'clock.

Monday, 24th April 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Richard Cross in the Chair.

Sir Henry Holland.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Torrens.	Mr. Brodrick.

Mr. *Joseph Rayner* was examined.

[Adjourned till Monday next, at One o'clock.

Monday, 1*st May* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir Henry Holland.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Brodrick.
Sir Sydney Waterlow.
Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Torrens.
Mr. William Holms.

Mr. *Frederick William Goddard* was further examined.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at One o'clock.

Thursday, 4*th May* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Torrens.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Brodrick.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Bryce.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Monday, 22nd May, at One o'clock.

Monday, 22*nd May* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Rankin.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Cropper.
Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Torrens.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 25*th May* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Rankin.
Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Torrens.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Monday, 12th June, at Twelve o'clock.

Monday, 12*th June* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Sir Sydney Waterlow.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Torrens.
Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Francis Buxton.

DRAFT REPORT, proposed by the *Chairman*, read the first time, as follows :—

"1. YOUR Committee have examined many of the medical officers of the several districts in the metropolis, and other persons well acquainted with the more densely populated parts of it, as also the representatives of the London Trades Council, and other working men; and they have themselves visited many of the areas reported as unhealthy under the Act of 1875. They are of opinion that the condition of such areas fully brings them within the terms of the Preamble and the third section of that Act; and that it is necessary to the public health that many of such houses, courts, and alleys, should be removed, and that some provision should be made for rebuilding dwellings for a certain portion of the working classes who may be so displaced.

"2. Your Committee are of opinion that nothing will contribute more to the social, moral, and physical improvement of these classes than the improvement of the houses and places in which they live. In carrying out such improvements they believe that there is ample room for the operation of all existing agencies. Sir Richard Cross' Acts, 1875—1879, Mr. Torrens' Acts, 1868—1879, The Public Health and other Sanitary and Local Acts, as well as for private enterprise.

"3. It may be useful here to call attention to the principles upon which the chief Acts relating to Artizans' Dwellings are based, and to state shortly the law upon the subject.

"4. The objects of the Bill of 1867-8, as originally brought in by Mr. Torrens, were to make provision, *first*, for taking down or improving dwellings occupied by working men which were unfit for human habitation, and *secondly*, for the building and maintenance of better dwellings instead; but the Act of 1868, passed on that Bill, contained the former class of provisions only, the latter having been struck out of the Bill during its progress through Parliament. Under these provisions, on the report of the officer of health that any inhabited building is in a condition dangerous to health, so as to be unfit for human habitation, the local authority (*i. e.*, the vestry or district board in the Metropolis, exclusive of the City of London), after ascertaining from their surveyor that the causes of the evil can be remedied by structural alterations, or that the premises ought to be demolished, have power respectively to order the owner to remove the premises, and in default, themselves to remove them; or they may order the owner to execute the necessary structural alterations, and in default, may either shut up or pull down the premises, or themselves execute the necessary work at the owner's expense. The amending Act of 1879 restored the provisions as to rebuilding, nearly as they were found in the Bill as originally brought in, and gave such owner power to require the local authority to purchase the premises, in which case the local authority is to hold such property upon trust primarily, so far as the Metropolis is concerned; *first*, for the providing, by the construction of new buildings, or the repairing or improvement of existing buildings, the labouring classes with suitable dwellings; *secondly*, for the opening out of closed or partially closed alleys or courts inhabited by the labouring classes, and the widening of the same by pulling down any building, or otherwise leaving such open spaces as may be necessary to make such alleys or courts healthful. The power of enforcing the duty of carrying out the provisions of these Acts in the Metropolis vests in the Metropolitan Board.

Bill No. 1, Nov. 1867.
31 & 32 Vict. c. 130. Preamble.
42 & 43 Vict. c. 64.

"5. The object of the Act of 1875 was to meet a different class of cases. The Preamble of the Act states that in many towns large areas are so built, and the buildings within them are so densely inhabited as to be highly injurious to the moral and physical welfare of the inhabitants; and in such areas a great number of houses, courts, and alleys, from want of light, air, ventilation, and proper conveniences, are unfit for human habitation; and fever and disease are constantly generated, thus causing death and loss of health not only in such places themselves, but also elsewhere; and owing to the fact that such places

38 & 39 Vict. c. 36. Preamble.

are the property of several owners, and that it is not in the power of any one owner to make the necessary alterations, it is necessary that such areas should be wholly re-constructed, due provision being made for dwellings for the working classes who should be displaced; and by this Act the duty is laid in the first instance on the local authority, on the report of the Medical Officer of Health, to make an improvement scheme for the re-arrangement and re-construction of the streets and houses within such area, taken as a whole. (The local authority being in this case in the City of London, the Commissioners of Sewers, and in the rest of the Metropolis, the Metropolitan Board, and in an urban sanitary district, the urban sanitary authority.)

Sect. 3.

Sect. 2.

Sect. 5.

"6. In such improvement scheme, the local authority may include even neighbouring lands, if necessary, for making the scheme efficient for sanitary purposes, or for widening the approaches for the purposes of ventilation and health; and by such scheme they are bound to provide for the accommodation of at the least as many persons of the working classes as may be displaced, in suitable dwellings within the limits, or in the vicinity of the area, or, as provided by the Amending Act of 1879, in some other place where equally convenient accommodation can be provided. Such scheme after receiving the approval of the Secretary of State or the Local Government Board as the confirming authority, and after confirmation of a Provisional Order by Parliament, is to be carried out by the local authority. And the duty is laid upon them to purchase the necessary lands, and they have full power to sell or let for the purpose of re-building according to the scheme. There is, however, no power of enforcing their duties in these respects provided by the Act, but on failure by the local authority to sell or let the land for these purposes within five years after the removal of the buildings, the confirming authority may sell the land by auction, subject to the conditions imposed by the scheme.

42 & 43 Vict. c. 63.

Sect. 6.

Sect. 9.

Sect. 10.

"7. The Acts of 1868-79 proceed upon the principle that the responsibility of maintaining his houses in proper condition falls upon the owner, and that if he fails in his duty the law is justified in stepping in and compelling him to perform it. They further assume that houses unfit for human habitation ought not to be used as dwellings, but ought, in the interests of the public, to be closed and demolished, and to be subsequently re-built. The expropriation of the owner is thus a secondary step in the transaction, and only takes place after the failure of other means of rendering the houses habitable.

"8. The Acts of 1875-79 proceed upon a different principle. They contemplate dealing with whole areas, where the houses are so structurally defective as to be incapable of repair, and so ill placed with reference to each other as to require, to bring them up to a proper sanitary standard, nothing short of demolition and re-construction. Accordingly, in this case, the local authority, armed with compulsory powers, at once enters as a purchaser, and on completion of the purchase proceeds forthwith to a scheme of re-construction. Though these two sets of Acts proceed upon different principles, they are each of them available for their own particular purpose, and are both, in the opinion of your Committee, alike necessary and useful.

"A.—As to the Acts of 1875—1879 (Sir R. A. Cross' Acts).

"9. Full particulars as to the extent to which these Acts have been carried out in London and elsewhere will be found in the Parliamentary Paper No. 41, 1881, and in the Appendix to this Report.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Acts, 1876-9.

"10. The 14 areas already dealt with by the Metropolitan Board have an extent of about 42 acres. They were inhabited by 20,335 persons, in 5,555 separate holdings; 3,349 of which holdings consisted of one room only, 1,483 of two rooms, 723 of three or more rooms. They were acquired under the compulsory powers of the Act of 1875, at the gross cost of 1,661,372 *l.*, or as almost the entire cost of two of the schemes, amounting to 80,036 *l.*, was borne by the Peabody Trustees, at a gross cost to the Metropolitan Board of 1,581,336 *l.*, including legal expenses and formation of new streets. About nine acres of the 42 have been devoted to new streets, at a cost of 95,500 *l.*, which is included in the above amount.

Report of Metropolitan Board, 974***.

Appendix, No. 3, 1882.

Appendix, No. 2, 1882.

"11. Owing to the obligations imposed by the Act of 1875, of providing accommodation for *at the least as many* persons of the working classes as may be displaced, it has been possible to reserve but a small portion of the areas thus cleared for commercial purposes, say between two-and-a-half and three acres, estimated to realise 109,000 *l.*

"12. Six sites were first sold to the Peabody Trustees, 68,299 feet at Whitechapel for 10,000 *l.*, and the rest at 5 *s.* per foot. Subsequent sales of most of the other sites have been made to the Industrial Dwellings Company and others, principally at the rate of 3 *s.* 4 *d.* per foot. If the land could have been sold free from any conditions as to re-building, it would, it is estimated, have realised three times the price for which it was actually sold.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Acts, 1876-9.

"13. The accommodation to be provided in these 14 areas under the Provisional Orders confirmed by Parliament, was to be for 22,753 persons, in 6,206 separate holdings, 1,535 of which holdings were to consist of one room only, 3,849 of two rooms, and 822 of three rooms or more.

"14. The

" 14. The estimated amount to be received for recoupment is about 370,000 *l.*, which would leave the net loss to the Metropolitan Board from the whole transaction at 1,211,336 *l.*, or at 1,115,836 *l.*, according as the cost of new streets is or is not included in the calculation ; of the whole sum about 560,000 *l.* is estimated as the loss due to the obligations to rebuild labourers' dwellings.

" 15. The areas dealt with were in almost every case cleared, and the persons living in any individual area were dispossessed with such compensation as was awarded to them before any re-building commenced. It is stated that very few, if any, of the families thus dispossessed returned for the purpose of occupying the new buildings; and in one case where a block built by the Peabody Trustees on an adjoining site was available for the persons dispossessed, and holdings were offered to them, very few accepted them. The buildings of the Peabody Trustees appear to be somewhat beyond the means, and unsuited to the wants and special callings, of the poorer class of persons occupying areas with which it has been found necessary to deal under the Act of 1875. 3008. 1881.

" 16. The Corporation of London were exempted from the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board in respect of the provisions of the Act of 1875 upon an understanding with the Home Secretary that they would act promptly under the Act within their own district. They proceeded at once with two schemes, in respect of Petticoat Square and Golden Lane. They cleared these two sites without the consent of the Home Secretary at a cost of 240,000 *l.*, and they dispossessed by the clearance 1,734 persons, in 495 separate holdings, and 1,010 rooms. The extent of the areas cleared, including the public ways then existing, amounted to 133,000 feet, or, deducting such public ways, to 111,000 feet, owing to the proposed re-arrangement and to the enlargement of streets, &c., the land available for building amounted only to 74,000 feet, on which it was proposed to re-house 1,783 persons, in 473 separate holdings and in 1,026 rooms. These sites have practically remained undealt with for about three years, as the Corporation have been unwilling to realise the great loss which would result from selling the land so cleared, subject to the condition of re-building labourers' dwellings. The best offers they have received for the land, subject to such conditions, has been for 1,250 *l.* per annum for the two areas. It is alleged that the market value of these sites for commercial purposes, after deducting the land required for new streets, would be 7,500 *l.* per annum, or six times the amount for which they would sell subject to the restrictions of the Act. As in the case of the areas in the Metropolitan Districts, the persons formerly occupying these sites are dispersed, and probably but few of the individuals displaced would return to occupy the buildings which would be built under the Act of 1875.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Act, 1877, ch. c.

Confirmation of Provisional Order Act, 1877.

" 17. The census returns of the City of London for the last 30 or 40 years show that the labouring population within its boundaries has been greatly reduced by the substitution of warehouses and offices for buildings suitable for the working people, in consequence of the enormous increase in the value of land.

" 18. The difficulty in carrying out the provisions of these Acts obviously arises from the great cost of doing so.

" 19. In the Appendix to this Report will be found a table showing the total area taken by the Metropolitan Board, the gross cost per foot, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot, and the percentage of loss on the gross cost. This percentage of loss, taking the average of the whole schemes together, would amount to about 82 per cent. On the other hand, it should be stated that this loss, as compared with the loss upon an ordinary street improvement, would be only about 7 per cent. more than on such street improvement. And there are other matters which should be mentioned as bearing upon the question of cost, such as the value of the land thrown into the public streets, which, in all the schemes of the Metropolitan Board, would amount to some 95,000 *l.* The additional rateable value of the new buildings, as compared with that of the old buildings, *e.g.*, the rateable value of the new buildings of the Peabody Trustees, on the six sites sold to them, will amount to 13,311 *l.*, as against the rateable value of the old premises on those sites of 9,986 *l.* And the ratepayers will no doubt reap advantage in the future (as pointed out by the Rev. S. A. Barnett, the Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, and an experienced poor law guardian) from the improved health and morals of the people, and consequent decrease of burden on the rates, for 'preventible sickness is the most costly of all things.' 675-680. 1882. 3473-4. 1881. 3215. 1882. Parliamentary Paper [c. 1143], 1875.

" 20. Still the problem is how to reduce the cost so far as can wisely be done, while at the same time giving full effect to the intention and spirit of the Acts.

" 21. The sources of cost are mainly three in number—

" 1st. The amount of compensation given.

" 2nd. The expense of procedure, including law charges.

" 3rd. The obligation to sell or relet for rebuilding artizans' dwellings.

" *As to the First Source of Cost.*

" 22. The intention of the Acts was clearly to guard against any excessive valuation of the property itself.

 " 23. The

38 & 39 Vict. c. 36, s. 19.

"23. The estimate of the value of lands within the unhealthy area was to be based upon the fair market value—

"1st. Such value to be calculated '*as estimated at the time of the valuation being made*' (so as to exclude improvements made for the purpose of increasing the amount of compensation).

"2nd. Such value to be calculated, '*due regard being had to the nature and "'then'" condition of the property, and the probable duration of the buildings in their existing state, and to the state of the repair thereof.*'

"3rd. '*Without any additional allowance in respect of compulsory purchase.*'

42 & 43 Vict. c. 63, s. 3.

"Subsequent provisions were made by the Amending Act of 1879, to prevent an owner from taking advantage of his own wrong through the unhealthy state of the premises, or by reason of overcrowding,

548–9. 1882.

"24. It has been suggested that much difficulty has arisen from the words in Section 3 of the Act of 1875, 'due regard being had to *all circumstances affecting such value*' (which were inserted at the instance of the late Mr. Cawley in committee), as granting what may be called a valuation of 'contingent probabilities,' as Mr. Goddard put it. Your Committee think that too much weight has been attached by the arbitrators to these words.

518. 1882.

"25. It has also been suggested that in the first instance the houses practically unfit for habitation should be placed in a category by themselves. Your Committee are of opinion that the character of the houses must necessarily differ much in the various areas, even in the unhealthy parts of such areas, and that it is better to leave the matter in the hands of the arbitrator, for him to deal with each property separately on its individual merits.

330–1. 1882.
482. 1882.

227. 1882.
331. 1882.
4484–5. 1881.
4276–9. 1881.
548. 1882.

"26. Sir Henry Hunt has told your Committee that if a house is in a dilapidated condition, and it would be waste of money to repair it, he should calculate the value upon the principle of what the land is worth and the materials, and that he should let the claimant have that and no more. Mr. Rodwell has told your Committee that in valuing such land he should only value it as subject to the evil surroundings in which it was there placed, and not as situated in a cleared space, which is equivalent to the principle enunciated by Mr. Goddard, that the price should be limited to what then was the value of the *locus in quo*, in the light of a building site. Your Committee are clearly of opinion that these principles are in conformity with the spirit and intention of the Acts, and should guide all future arbitration in this matter.

220. 1882.
351–2. 1882.
4904–6. 1881.

"27. The question of compensation for trade profit is a more difficult matter to deal with. It has been doubted whether, in strictness of law, the Act contemplated any compensation for trade profit at all. It is difficult, however, to contest the conclusion of Sir H. Hunt and Mr. Rodwell, that where the business is connected with any particular holding, the occupier is entitled to moderate compensation; but your Committee are of opinion that the arbitrator should in all such cases consider well whether the trader has not the opportunity of setting up his trade somewhere in the immediate neighbourhood without positive injury, in which case he would clearly be entitled only to proper expenses connected with removal.

"28. There still remains the question of weekly tenants. Your Committee find that upon this point the several arbitrators have proceeded on somewhat different principles.

233. 1882.
4895. 1881.

"29. Sir H. Hunt, with the concurrence of the corporation of Liverpool, has been in the habit of giving 1 *l.* a year for every year that a tenant has been in occupation, not exceeding, however, in any one case the sum of 15 *l.* Mr. Rodwell, on the other hand, lets each case stand on its own merits. When there were little businesses, such as laundries, cobbler's work, &c., he gave somewhat more than a simple sum for removal; whereas when a man was simply a weekly tenant of a house, he gave him 20 *s.* or 2 *l.* to enable him to pay for removal and finding a holding somewhere else. Your Committee are disposed to approve of the principle followed by Mr. Rodwell.

3055. 1882.

"30. Your Committee find that the whole amount of compensation thus awarded to weekly tenants forms only a small item in the ultimate cost, and that it is reasonable to give a fair compensation, and advantageous to the local authority to give an inducement to remove rather than to be obliged to resort to legal proceedings to enforce removal. But they are strongly of opinion that no money payment should be made till actual removal takes place, and they attach great value to any assistance which the local authority may render in finding accommodation elsewhere for the persons so displaced.

"*As to the Second Source of Cost.*

3454, &c. 1882.

"31. The machinery for estimating compensation under these Acts appears to be far more economical and more speedy than that provided by the Lands Clauses Acts, but your Committee think that it may be still further simplified with advantage.

410. 1882.
4919. 1881.

"32. Both Sir H. Hunt and Mr. Rodwell are agreed that the provisional award should be dispensed with, and that this would cause saving both in expense and in time.

"33. In

"33. In this view the town clerk of Liverpool, who approved warmly of the machinery of the Acts, as compared with that of the Lands Clauses Acts, entirely agrees, and your Committee recommend that this view should be carried out at once. 3465–6. 1882.

"34. On the question of costs, your Committee are of opinion that with a view to saving expense, the salary or remuneration, travelling and other expenses of the arbitrator should be certified by the confirming authority before payment by the local authority; and that the 29th paragraph of the Schedule to the Act of 1875 should be amended so as to make it quite clear that the arbitrator has the power to refuse to give costs, if he thinks the case one in which no costs ought to be given. 188. 1882. 4932, &c. 1881. 422, &c. 1882.

"35. It has also been pointed out with great force that in order to prevent exaggerated claims, some period should be fixed, after which no person should be entitled to recover or claim compensation for any alteration in term or tenure, or for any improvements in the property, unless made compulsorily for sanitary purposes. 4928–9. 1881. 649. 1882. 335. 1882.

"36. Your Committee are entirely of this opinion. Whether this period should be the publication by the local authority of the advertisement stating the fact of a scheme having been made, or the making of the Provisional Order by the confirming authority is a question for consideration, but your Committee would recommend the earlier date. 38 & 39 Vict. c. 36, s. 6.

"37. Your Committee are also of opinion that the appeal to a jury in matters of compensation, which is now allowed when the amount in dispute exceeds 500 *l.*, should not be allowed except in those cases where the amount exceeds 1,000 *l.* 38 & 39 Vict. Schedule, par. 26.

"*As to the Third Source of Cost.*

"38. Your Committee are of opinion that there is a great difference between the condition of the Metropolis and provincial towns. The element of cost under this head arises from the use of land in central positions, and therefore of great value for commercial purposes for such comparatively unremunerative purposes as artizans' dwellings. The Amending Act of 1879, which provides that other lands equally suitable might be used in lieu of the actual sites cleared, went far to meet the difficulty, but unfortunately almost all the schemes adopted under the Acts were framed before the Amending Act came into force.

"39. In the provincial towns there does not seem to be the necessity for insisting on the rebuilding of houses for the classes displaced; and your Committee are of opinion that, as a rule, and from natural causes and the general process of building, equally convenient accommodation can be and is, generally speaking, provided for the persons of the working class displaced by any scheme at some place other than within or in the immediate vicinity of the area comprised in the scheme. The experience of Edinburgh and Glasgow points to this conclusion, and the action of the Local Government Board, in relieving the Corporation of Liverpool from selling or leasing the area taken for rebuilding artizans' dwellings confirms them in this opinion, and the distinction between the metropolis and provincial towns on this point is clearly recognised in Mr. Torrens' Amending Act of 1879. Parliamentary Paper, c. 1143. 1875. 3481–7. 1882. 42 & 43 Vict. c. 64, s. 14.

"40. It may be doubted whether, under Section 12 of the Act of 1875, the Local Government Board had this dispensing power; but your Committee recommend that in the case of provincial towns, except in such special cases as may appear to the confirming authority to require such a provision, the local authority should be relieved of this obligation, and that the Act of 1875 should be amended accordingly.

"41. In the Metropolis, on the contrary, very great hardship would often follow if the provisions for replacement in or near the area of displacement were wholly done away with. The special calling of many of the workpeople, the hours of their work, the employment of their children, the maintenance of their home life, the economy of living together in a family, the cheapness of food owing to the nearness of the great evening markets, &c., render it very desirable that a large portion should be enabled to rehouse themselves in or near their old places of living; and if no fresh dwellings be provided, the evils of overcrowding will at once increase. The evidence of the medical officers, of Mr. Rodwell, Canon Gilbert, the Rev. S. A. Barnett, the working men themselves, Miss Octavia Hill, the Hon. Miss Stanley, and others, is conclusive on this point. 1740. 1882.

"42. Still it is equally true that these observations do not apply to the whole of the population to be displaced. Many without any special calling may live in one place as well as in another. The facilities of transit recently offered by cheap trains, by boats, by tramways, &c., have enabled many to live in the suburbs and elsewhere, who can do so consistently with their calling. It must also be observed that in this respect the circumstances of some parts of the Metropolis differ much from those of other parts; it would therefore be impossible to lay down safely any hard-and-fast line for the whole of the Metropolis.

"43. Your Committee, on the whole, are of opinion that the existing law, which requires that "the improvement scheme shall provide for the accommodation of *at the least* as many persons of the working class as may be displaced," may be relaxed, and that the accommodation to be required should vary from one-half to two-thirds, as the confirming 38 & 39 Vict. c. 36, s. 5.

firming authority may think fit, on the report of the person holding the local inquiry in such case on their behalf.

"44. The effect of this relaxation will be not merely greatly to reduce the cost, but it will in many cases enable the Metropolitan Board in dealing with an unhealthy area to refrain from pulling down the whole number of the houses, at all events at once, in cases when they may be able to render parts of the area sufficiently healthy by pulling down certain houses only, and so letting in light and air and giving ventilation to the remaining parts. As a fair example of this, your Committee are of opinion that one of the schemes under the consideration of the Metropolitan Board, which they visited and which was situated near the river at Wapping, might in part be so treated with advantage, a plan of proceeding which was of course impracticable when the whole number displaced had to be rehoused.

"45. With regard to the City of London itself, your Committee are of opinion that in some respects it stands upon an exceptional footing, owing to the very exceptional value of land within its limits; and they are of opinion as regards the schemes affecting the City, that it is especially in such cases that the confirming authority would be well advised in giving full scope to the provisions of the amending Act of 1879, under which the accommodation to be provided may be provided elsewhere, and within some reasonable and suitable distance. In this case, of course, the existence of accommodation for transit by railway, boat, or tramway, would form an important element in considering what was a reasonable and suitable distance.

"46. It is of almost equal importance that such accommodation as is required should be provided *speedily:* To effect this it may be desirable that the work be carried out in sections—that the conditions of sale or lease be as simple as possible—that the greatest facilities be given to the buyers or leaseholders to lay out the ground as they may think best, subject only to the condition that the actual object of the Act itself be strictly complied with. In many cases the lower story may be well devoted to shops, with convenient rooms attached on the next story or elsewhere for the accommodation of those who keep the shops; but in such cases there should be a separate entrance to the dwellings for artizans entirely distinct from the entrance to the shop. In many cases it may be necessary to provide special accommodation for the requirements of the particular business of the persons displaced, such as costermongers, &c.; this would come under the meaning of the term '*suitable dwellings,*' which will be found in the fifth section of the Act of 1875; in many cases it would be well to have a larger number of single rooms than have hitherto been provided, so as to suit the wants of the poorer class; in many it would be well to have playgrounds for children on the top of the roof or on the ground below, such as are to be found in the case of many of the improved dwellings already built.

"47. Your Committee are of opinion that the Peabody Trustees, who may fairly be considered as a *quasi* public body, should specially undertake the duty of supplying the wants of the poorer class of the persons displaced.

"48. In connection with this subject your Committee would call attention to the importance of favouring in every way facilities of transit between the great centres of industry and the outlying districts, and especially between the metropolis and its suburbs. Owing to economic causes, land in the central parts of London is, generally speaking, becoming too valuable to be easily made use of as sites for dwellings for the working classes, and property of this kind, including areas scheduled under these Acts, is being constantly bought up and converted to other purposes. Side by side with this movement there is a large migration of the working classes to the suburbs, where in some places private enterprise is busy erecting tenements, and providing cheap means of locomotion. The question of the condition of this suburban population, whose employment lies in London, has necessarily occupied the attention of your Committee, and induced them to make the following recommendations:

1388, &c. 1882. "1st. That the conditions as to workmen's trains within a certain distance from London now imposed upon the Great Eastern Railway Company should, to some extent, be enforced in the case of other railways as opportunities may offer. They say 'to some extent,' for, in their opinion, the obligations imposed upon the Great Eastern Railway are, in some instances—such, for example, as the distances to which the trains are bound to run—severe for universal application. Such an opportunity has just offered in the case of the Regent's Canal Bill. They have strongly recommended this Bill to the notice of the Board of Trade, in consequence of which proper clauses have been inserted on their suggestion.

1903, &c. 1882. "2nd. That many of the sanitary provisions of the Metropolitan Building Acts be at once extended to the suburbs, under the control of the several local authorities.

"3rd. That all existing sanitary legislation should be more fully enforced, especially in those parts of the suburbs where buildings are so rapidly springing up.

"B.—As to the Acts of 1868–1879 (Mr. Torrens' Acts).

"49. 'The Act of 1868 was, as has already been pointed out, considerably altered in its passage through Parliament, but, though limited in its scope, it proved of great value, and up to 1875 was not unfrequently put in force by certain vestries and local boards. In

1 1879 an amending Act was passed, but as action has rarely been taken under it, owing the prevalent misapprehension that an alternative method was in *all* cases offered by r R. Cross's Act of 1875, your Committee have no sufficient means of reporting as to s working." 1225, &c. 1881. 1754, &c. 1882.

" 50. Your Committee regard these provisions as most useful, and regret that they have ot been more constantly and universally put in force. They would strongly urge upon e vestries and district boards the necessity of putting them fully in force without lay.

" 51. Your Committee reported last Session that, in their opinion, with a view to doing , immediate attention should be given by them to those areas which the medical officer d reported to the Metropolitan Board as unhealthy areas, but which the Metropolitan oard had not included in any scheme under the Act of 1875, on the ground of the small- ss of such areas. They would again press this point strongly upon the notice of the veral vestries and district boards.

" 52. The intention of Parliament in sanctioning these statutes was to provide the eans whereby local authorities might secure the effectual repair of dilapidated dwellings, , when necessary, their gradual reconstruction. As the work of bit-by-bit replacement n never cease to be an object of municipal care in over-peopled localities, it was hoped at it would come to be regarded as a constantly recurring duty which, if performed with scrimination, would lead to the permanent improvement and rateable capability of a strict, without aggravating in the process the evils of over-crowding. The scope of ese Acts may with advantage be distinguished from that of the Statutes of 1875–9, th which it is not expedient that it should be liable to be confounded. There is ample idence to show that a vestry or district board has frequently deferred taking action in e matter, misled by a hope that the Metropolitan Board might undertake the rebuilding an unhealthy court or a block of decayed houses as a portion of some general scheme. is important that such illusory and injurious expectations should be set aside. 467–480. 1881.

" 53. Your Committee are of opinion that these Acts may be materially improved by owing the local authority to remove houses, though in themselves in good condition, nen by doing so they could open up courts and alleys, and so give the necessary air, ght, and ventilation, so as to render such courts or alleys healthy; in which case the ner would be entitled to full compensation, just as much as the owner of premises taken der the 5th section of the Act of 1875 for widening existing approaches to unhealthy eas. In such cases your Committee think that any additional value accruing in con- quence to houses adjoining the house so pulled down, should, when they belong to the me owner, be taken into consideration in assessing compensation.

" 54. Your Committee think that the operation of these Acts should not be confined to lividual premises, but should be extended to several houses in a street, court, or alley, thin the limits of what may be called a mere local, as opposed to a metropolitan provement. There can be no doubt (as already suggested) that one reason why these cts have not been more generally enforced, especially since the passing of the Act of 75, has been the desire of the local authorities to avoid the expense falling on the local strict, and the hope that the matter would be dealt with by the Metropolitan Board out the metropolitan rates. The only power to enforce the operation of these Acts rests in e Metropolitan Board, under the 12th section of the Act of 1879. This provision has ver yet been put in force, and it is in evidence that no application has ever been made the Board to act upon it It is not within the province of your Committee to enter on the question of the government of London; but so long as matters remain in their esent condition, they would suggest that in case of neglect by the local authority to act the representations of the medical officer, the board of guardians, or any owner of operty in the immediate neighbourhood, should have power to report the matter to the etropolitan Board of Works, with a view to their taking action under the 12th section. 775–9. 1881. 5625, &c. 1881.

" C.—As to the Metropolitan Street Improvement Acts, 1872, 1877.

" 55. It is not necessary to enter upon the consideration of the provisions of the Act 1872, as all the places to which that Act applies have been already dealt with by the etropolitan Board, and no complaint now arises for further consideration. 1574–5. 1882.

" 56. But the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 does present serious difficulties. This tion, after reciting that the making of the street improvements involves the removal of ny houses, and that it is expedient that provision be made for the accommodation of h of the labouring classes as will be displaced by such removal, enacts that the Board carrying into effect the provisions of the Act shall, for the purpose of providing such ommodation, acquire or appropriate so much of certain specified lands, or such other ds as a Secretary of State shall deem sufficient, and shall, as soon as may be, sell or the same for the purpose of the erection or adaptation and continuance thereupon of table dwelling-houses or lodging-houses for persons of the labouring classes; and it also acts that before the Board shall, without the consent of a Secretary of State, take for purposes of the Act 15 houses or more occupied at the time of the passing of the , either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or 40 & 41 Vict. c. 235, s. 33.

 lodgers,

lodgers, the Board shall prove to the satisfaction of such Secretary of State that sufficie accommodation in suitable dwellings has been provided elsewhere upon such lands for same number of persons.

1580, &c. 1882. "Under these provisions two great difficulties have arisen.

"1st. As to the restriction against taking down more than 15 houses at any time.

"2nd. As to the appropriating land for the purpose of providing accommodat for the whole of the labouring classes to be displaced.

"57. Your Committee are of opinion that certain relaxations of this Act are necess in the public interest—

"1st. As to the number of houses that may be removed at any time.

"2nd. As to the necessity of rebuilding to the extent provided by the Act.

"58. Two schemes under the Act have been especially brought under the notice your Committee by the Metropolitan Board.

"1*st. The West End New Streets and Street Improvements.*

40 & 41 Vict. c. 235, s. 4. 3678. 1882. "59. By this scheme 5,300 of such persons were liable to be displaced within the lin of deviation.

3705. 1882. 3679. 1882. "60. The Metropolitan Board, however, do not intend to take the whole area co prised within the limits of deviation, and are content to surrender their power to extent which would reduce this number to 4,000 only, and they propose to provide acco modation for one-half of this number as follows:—

"1st. They have reserved accommodation for more than 600 on the site in Pye-street, Westminster, already dealt with under the Artizans' and Labourc Dwellings Act of 1875. This accommodation has been provided in excess of accommodation required under that Act, and for the express purpose of acco modating persons to be displaced under the improvement scheme now under c sideration.

1581, &c. 1882. 3675. 1882. "Secondly. They are ready and willing to clear the plots coloured blue on the p presented to your Committee, and marked No. 1 and No. 2 respectively, which h both been set apart for this purpose, and to let or sell these plots for this purp without delay. This plan will afford further accommodation for 1,470 persons. soon as these two plots have been built over, but not before, they desire to go with the rest of the improvement scheme as they may find expedient, relieved of obligations of the 33rd section above alluded to.

"61. Your Committee asssent to this proposal, and think that it ought to be carried at once.

"2*nd. Gray's Inn-road Improvement.*

3622, &c. 1882. "62. By this scheme 1,930 persons of the working class are liable to be displac Out of this number the persons in fixed employment within one mile radius Baldwin's-gardens, Gray's Inn-road, amount to 1,155.

"63. The Metropolitan Board propose that the part coloured pink on the map p duced before your Committee should be thrown into Gray's Inn-road; that the wh frontage, coloured yellow, 50 feet in depth, be devoted to commercial purposes; and t the remainder should be devoted to the building of artizans' dwellings, to an extent wh would provide accommodation for 1,200 persons.

"64. The work to be completed in two sections. In the case of each section—

"1st. The site for artizans' dwellings to be cleared and disposed of, in the fi instance.

"2nd. As soon as this site has been built over, but not before, the correspondi frontage to be dealt with, as the Board may desire, for commercial purposes.

"65. And, subject to these conditions, the Board desire that they should be relie of the obligations of the 33rd section, above alluded to.

"66. Your Committee assent to this proposal, and think that it ought to be carried at once.

"67. In conclusion: your Committee, while fully alive to the necessity of dealing w the other matters alluded to above, are of opinion that—

"1st. It is desirable that a short Amending Bill of the Acts of 1875–79 sho at once be brought into Parliament, and, if possible, passed this Session, to ca out so much of the above recommendations as relates to relaxing the Acts respect of the number of persons for whom accommodation should be provided

all pending or future schemes in the provincial towns as well as in London, and to the doing away with the necessity for a provisional award, and also as to the period after which no compensation should be given for alteration in term or tenure, or for improvement made. 639, 640. 1882. 4928, 4929. 1881.

"2ndly. It is desirable to amend the Act of 1868, and the Amending Act of 1879, as suggested, without delay.

"3rdly. It is also desirable to pass an Act for relaxing the provisions of the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act, 1877, on the points above suggested, and this also, in their opinion, ought to be brought before Parliament and passed during the present Session, and they are also of opinion that the same policy ought to be followed in any future Metropolitan Street Improvement Act.

"4thly. They would recommend the alteration of the Standing Order, No. 184, so as to carry out the views indicated in this Report, still, however, retaining sufficient safeguards in the interests of the persons to be displaced, in accordance with the general tenour of this Report."

DRAFT REPORT proposed by the *Chairman* read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraph be inserted in the proposed Report:—"Your Committee were unable last Session to complete taking the evidence upon matters referred to them, but they presented an interim Report, in which suggestions were made in the direction or enlarging the discretion of the confirming authority, and of justifying a liberal interpretation of the powers vested in that authority. They have reason to believe that some of their suggestions have since been acted upon with advantage"—(Sir *Henry Holland*).—Question, That this paragraph be inserted in the proposed Report,—put, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 1—3, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 4—5, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 6—9, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 10, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 11, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 12—14, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 15, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 16.—Amendment proposed in line 18, after the word "Act," to insert the words "The difference would represent 150 *l.* per room, over and above the cost of the new buildings and of their site"—(Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*).—Question put, That those words be there inserted.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 9.	Noes, 6.
Mr. Brodrick.	Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Bryce.	Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. Cropper.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Torrens.
Mr. William Holms.	Sir Sydney Waterlow.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.	
Mr. Rankin.	

Another Amendment made.—Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 17, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 18, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 19, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 20—22, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 23—24, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 25, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 26, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 27—32, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 33, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 34—37, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 38—40, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 41—44, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 45, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 46, *agreed to.*

Paragraph, 47, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph 48.—Amendment proposed in line 13, after the word "that," to leave out the word "the," in order to insert the word "similar"—(Mr. *Francis Buxton*).—Question put, That the word "the" stand part of the paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 6.	Noes, 8.
Mr. Arthur Balfour.	Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Cropper.	Mr. Bryce.
Viscount Emlyn.	Mr. Francis Buxton.
Sir Henry Holland.	Mr. John Hollond.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Rankin.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
	Sir Matthew Ridley.
	Mr. Torrens.

Question, That the word "similar" be there inserted, put, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 49—50, *agreed to.*

Paragraph 51, amended, and *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 52—62, *agreed to.*

Paragraphs 64—67, *postponed.*

[Adjourned till Monday next, at Two o'clock.

Monday, 19*th June* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir RICHARD CROSS in the Chair.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.	Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Hastings.	Mr. Cropper.
Sir Henry Holland.	Mr. Bryce.

Postponed paragraph 64, amended, and *agreed to.*

Postponed paragraphs, 65—66, *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraph be inserted in the Report:—"As this course will relieve the Corporation of a large part of the loss which they would incur in carrying out fully the Act of 1875, and as it is not probable that there will be further schemes in the future within the area of the City, your Committee think that the Corporation of London should contribute to the cost incurred by the Metropolitan Board in carrying out the Act, in proportion to the rateable value of the City, after deducting their own special losses. This contribution will be a sensible relief to the Metropolitan ratepayers in respect of the operations under the Act of 1875, rendered necessary in part by the removal of the working population from the City proper into the adjacent Metropolitan districts"—(Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*).—Question put, That this paragraph be inserted in the Report.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 6.	Noes, 6.
Mr. Bryce.	Mr. Cropper.
Mr. Francis Buxton.	Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. John Hollond.	Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.	Sir Henry Holland.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.	Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Rankin.	Mr. Torrens.

Whereupon the *Chairman* declared himself with the *Noes.*

Postponed

Postponed paragraph 67.—Amendment proposed in page xxvii, line 11, after the words "Improvement Act," to insert the words "Your Committee hope that if the recommendations they propose to be carried out this Session obtain the sanction of Parliament, no time should be lost by the Corporation of the City, by the Metropolitan Board of Works, by the Vestries, and by the District Boards of Works, in giving effect to these designs for local improvements"—(Mr. *Torrens*).—Question, That those words be there inserted,—put, and *agreed to.*

Paragraph, as amended, *agreed to.*

Question, That this Report, as amended, be the Report of the Committee to the House, —put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, To Report, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and an Appendix.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

NAME OF WITNESS.	PROFESSION OR CONDITION.	From whence Summoned.	Number of Days Absent from Home, under Orders of Committee.	Allowance during Absence from Home.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Mr. Richard William Keating.	Silver Plaiter -	- -	Allowance during absence from work for one day.	- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. Joseph Charles Kirkham.	House Painter -	- -		- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. John Field - -	- ditto - -	- -		- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. T. E. Powell -	Bookbinder - -	- -		- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. Thomas Abrey -	Carpenter - -	- -		- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. Alfred Evans -	House Painter -	- -		- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. Charles Hodson -	Messenger, American Legation.	- -		- 7 6	- -	- 7 6
Mr. Joseph Rayner -	Town Clerk of Liverpool.	Liverpool -	1	2 2 -	1 13 -	3 15 -
				TOTAL - - - £.		6 7 6

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Thursday, 2*nd March* 1882.

	PAGE
Mr. Edward Eyre Ashby	1
Mr. Frederick William Goddard	7
Mr. John Crouch	10

Monday, 6*th March* 1882.

Sir Henry Arthur Hunt, C.B.	11

Thursday, 9*th March* 1882.

Sir Henry Arthur Hunt, C.B.	28
Mr. Frederick William Goddard	34

Monday, 13*th March* 1882.

Mr. Frederick William Goddard	48
Mr. John Grant	51
Mr. Robert Reid	55

Thursday, 16*th March* 1882.

Mr. Samuel Walker	65
Rev. Canon Gilbert	74

Monday, 20*th March* 1882.

Mr. William Birt	87
Mr. Frederick William Goddard	94
Dr. Septimus Gibbon	103

Thursday, 23*rd March* 1882.

	PAGE
Dr. Septimus Gibbon	107
Dr. John William Tripe	112

Monday, 27*th March* 1882.

Mr. William Keating	118
Mr, Joseph Charles Kirkham	124
Mr. John Field	126
Rev. John Rose	131

Thursday, 30*th March* 1882.

Mr. Thomas Eckford Powell	134
Mr. Thomas Abrey	140
Mr. Charles Hodson	143
Mr. Alfred Evans	148
Hon. Maude Stanley	152
Miss Octavia Hill	158

Monday, 3*rd April* 1882.

Hon. Maude Stanley	161
Rev. Samuel Augustus Barnett	161
Miss Octavia Hill	168

Monday, 24*th April* 1882.

Mr. Joseph Rayner	178

Monday, 1*st May* 1882.

Mr. Frederick William Goddard	186

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Thursday, 2nd March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Sir Richard Cross.
Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Hastings.
Sir Henry T. Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Leamy.
Right Hon. G. J. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Justin M'Carthy.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.
Sir Sydney Waterlow.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. EDWARD EYRE ASHBY, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1. WE propose to-day to confine our evidence entirely to what has been done since we met last in the last Session of Parliament, and I would call your attention to the first paragraph of our Report: "That for the purpose of facilitating sales and the completion of the schemes already sanctioned by Parliament, the confirming authority, if so pleased, may safely allow the immediate demolition of any houses closed by the local authority;" has anything taken place between the City and the Secretary of State upon that paragraph?—No, we have not had any communication with the Secretary of State.

2. Not upon that point, you mean?—Not upon that point.

3. Then you mean that no houses have been pulled down since we met last Session?—No, we have not taken any proceedings under this Act since last Session.

4. None?—Not any.

5. I do not mean in reference to new schemes, but in reference to your own old schemes?—In reference to our own schemes.

6. Then am I right in saying that, so far as the City is concerned, you have already cleared the whole of the ground?—The whole of the ground of the schemes that had reached perfection. We had no more work to do in the Golden-lane and the Petticoat-square sites.

7. Therefore there was no necessity to make any application to the Secretary of State, because it was all cleared?—No, not on that clause.

8. Now the second clause is this: "That with a view of lessening the expense of carrying out the intentions of the Act of 1875, the confirming authority may well assent to the basement and

Chairman—continued.

ground floor of any building being let as shops or workshops, and that in considering the amount of accommodation to be provided for the working classes displaced by any scheme, the confirming authority will be justified in giving a liberal interpretation to the relaxing power in the 4th section of the Amending Act of 1879, and may take into account, as in part fulfilment of the obligation to provide equally convenient accommodation, any suitable existing facilities of transport to a reasonable distance, and at reasonable prices, by water, tramways, or workmen's trains;" has any communication taken place between you upon that point?—Between us and the Secretary of State, not any; neither from him to us, nor from us to him.

9. Then the third part of our Report is to this effect: "That the local authority should give every facility to purchasers by simplifying conditions of sale and otherwise, and should do all in their power to promote sales by public competition and otherwise, for the purposes of the Act;" have you taken any steps under that?—No; that would involve communicating with the Secretary of State.

10. Have you taken no steps under that?—No, we have not.

11. Then are we to understand that the City have taken no steps at all since we parted last Session?—I have a history of what we have done: I thought perhaps you would like to have this paper put in.

12. Yes; then give us in your own words what has been done by the City since we last met?—In September last, the Report of the Committee having been received, was laid before a

Chairman—continued.

meeting of the Commission; it was then referred to the Finance and Improvement Committee to take such steps in the matter as they might deem advisable. Acting upon the Report of your Committee, the engineer was instructed to consider and report what modifications and alterations in the conditions for letting the land could be made in conformity with the recommendation of your Committee; in October the Commission instructed their Committee to renew the application to the Secretary of State.

13. What application do you refer to?—An application we had formerly made, which I put in evidence before you last year, for permission to utilise the ground floors and basements of the proposed dwellings for commercial purposes, and some other relaxations. In November the engineer to the Commission laid before his committee a report in which he urged the desirability of our seeking power to utilise in accordance with your Report the ground floor and basement, and also that we should substitute other less valuable sites for artizans' dwellings in accordance with the permission you recommended, and also that builders might be allowed (and this was a new feature) to deviate from the plan laid down, provided the areas assigned for building, recreation, and ventilation were not materially altered. But about that time it became known to us that the larger area, the Golden-lane area, was about to be scheduled for a railway, and since then the whole area has been scheduled in the Regent's Canal, City and Docks Railway Bill, which is before Parliament this Session; so that we felt precluded from dealing with that area altogether. We cannot touch it. It is scheduled; and for this reason, and in the hope that the inquiry before this Select Committee of the House would facilitate our obtaining modifications we held our hand in respect of the smaller area, the Petticoat-square area, waiting in hope that your Report when complete will give us the relief that we want, and that we shall be able at once then to do something.

14. Is that quite a justifiable proceeding on behalf of the City?—We are in such a deadlock that we do not know what to do. We cannot complicate the matter, for the railway has scheduled the property.

15. Taking the smaller area, what do you say as to that?—There we should move, but we thought it better to wait until your proceedings were finally completed.

16. When the Act was passed there was a communication made to the City as to whether the rate should be made over the whole metropolis, the City included, or whether the City should be exempt, and treated by itself; do you remember that?—Yes, quite well.

17. And in consequence of the undertaking, so to speak, by the City, to act promptly, that relaxation was given to the City, and they were put upon a different footing; that is so, is it not?—Yes.

18. Then we had it in evidence last year that the City, even without the concurrence of the Secretary of State, had pulled down all the houses; that is so, is it not?—Yes, the City had cleared the whole site.

Chairman—continued.

19. It had cleared the ground without applying to the Secretary of State?—Was that so?

20. I believe so. However, that ground has now being lying idle for a long time, has it not?—It has, indeed, to our own very serious loss.

21. That being the case, was it not incumbent upon the City, at all events, with reference to the smaller area, to do all in their power to let it?—We have been doing that. We have always been willing to let, and anxious to let.

22. But you have not acted upon our recommendation of last Session, have you?—We can get no offers.

23. You have not modified your terms at all, have you?—No; I think before we approach the Secretary of State for the modification of the terms we are anxious to know the full result of your inquiry.

24. That is to say, you would like to wait for another year?—No, I hope not.

25. At any rate you would like to wait till the end of this inquiry?—It might help you to form an opinion as to the difficulty of our position if I tell you that we have recently had an offer of 410 *l.* per annum for the Golden-lane site, which we were not able to let. That site cost us over 100,000 *l.*, not reckoning the interest. With that offer of 410 *l.* per year was coupled the condition that shops and basements might be erected on the frontages in Golden-lane and Barbican to a depth of 45 feet. That offer was less than we had previously had, and it shows the difficulty of dealing with this matter.

26. What I understood you to say was that the larger area having been scheduled for a railway company you had rather taken advantage of that fact to allow the whole thing to lie over, and have not touched even the smaller scheme?—I do not put it quite in that way.

27. Pretty nearly so, do you not?—The reason why we had not dealt with the larger area was, undoubtedly, our inability to touch it, because it was scheduled. The reason why we are not dealing with the smaller area is because we do not feel ourselves in a position to take it up at the present moment, as things now are.

28. That is to say, you have not acted upon the recommendation that the Committee made last year?—We have not yet, but our Committee is instructed to deal with it, and they may do so.

29. But that recommendation was made many months ago?—Yes; there is a proposition now being moved, probably at this very moment, in the Court of Common Council, asking the Court to authorise the Committee to negotiate with the Commissioners of Sewers. Whether they will grant that authority I do not know, but that is the proposal that the Court of Common Council should negotiate with the Commissioners of Sewers.

30. Considering the way in which the Act of 1875 was framed, they were under special obligations to do all they could, were they not?—And they have shown their desire to do it.

31. They have not done as much as the Metropolitan Board, have they?—For our size I think we have.

32. You have done nothing as I understand; you have not sold a single site, have you?—No.

33. Have

Chairman—continued.

33. Have the Metropolitan Board?—I am very glad they have. This report contains the history of our proceedings: "Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1875, and Amendment Act, 1879. Proceedings of the Commissioners of Sewers for the City of London therein since the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1881. 13th September 1881. On the Report of the Select Committee being laid before the Commissioners of Sewers by the City Remembrancer, it was 'referred to the Finance and Improvement Committee to take such steps in the matter as they may deem advisable.'" "16th September 1881. The Committee instructed the engineer to consider and report what modifications and alterations can be made in the Golden-lane, &c., Improvement Scheme, in conformity with the Report of the Select Committee. 25th October 1881. The Commissioners instructed the Committee to renew their application to the Home Secretary for permission to utilise the ground floors and basements of the proposed dwellings for shops and commercial purposes. 18th November 1881. The engineer reported, urging the desirability of seeking power to utilise the ground floors and basements for commercial purposes; to substitute other less valuable sites for artizans' dwellings at a reasonable distance from the City; and that builders might be allowed to deviate from the plan laid down, provided the areas assigned respectively for building, ventilation, and recreation were not materially altered. At that time it was known that the Golden-lane area was about to be included in a railway project to be submitted to Parliament, and it now appears that the whole area is scheduled in the Regent's Canal, City and Docks Railway Scheme. For this reason, and in the hope that the inquiry before the Select Committee of the House of Commons would facilitate their obtaining modifications of their Artizans' Dwellings Improvement Scheme, the Commissioners have delayed further communication with the Home Secretary upon the subject. They have recently had an offer of 410 *l.* per annum for the Golden-lane site, which has cost over 100,000 *l.*, and the offer was coupled with the condition that shops and basements might be erected on the frontages in Golden-lane and Barbican to a depth of 45 feet. This offer was less than they had previously had, without such condition, and, of course, could not be accepted.'

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

34. When were these two sites cleared?—About two years ago.

35. Then all the population that was living upon these two sites have gone?—Yes.

36. And you have done nothing really practically towards letting this land since?—We have been striving to let it. We have spent money in advertising, and we have tried every means in our power to let it, but without success. Our friends at the Board of Works have been in very much the same position.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

37. The Board of Works has been in the same position as what?—They have been trying to let, without very great success.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

38. Would the land sell at a high value if freed from the conditions of the Act of 1875?—I think so.

39. Have you formed an opinion as to what the real value of the land is, irrespective of those conditions?—It is very hard, indeed, to say, but more than 2 *s.* a foot.

40. What did the two sites cost you?—£. 240,000, I think.

41. What would you consider the commercial value, irrespective of the conditions of the Act of 1875?—My impression is that about 2 *s.* a foot would be a low estimate.

42. At how much would that work out?—My evidence last year shows that.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

43. Then you are no nearer letting the sites now than you were then?—No.

44. You have taken no steps at all; you have not advertised, have you?—We have advertised very largely, but not quite lately.

Chairman.

45. I understand you to say that you have not taken advantage of the recommendations we made with reference to relaxations by the Secretary of State?—No; not yet. We are very thankful for those recommendations as to relaxations, and they afford us the only hope there is of dealing with the sites at all. We have not seen our way during these few months towards doing much.

46. When the City was placed on a footing by itself, instead of being joined in one common metropolitan rate, one of the arguments used was that the inhabitants of the metropolis were afraid of your sending the poor out of the City because land is so valuable there, into the adjoining parts of the metropolis?—I know that it was said so.

47. Therefore it was on that ground that the undertaking was given that those persons who were living in those slums of the City that were to be dealt with, should not be driven out by the action of the City; that is so, is it not?—Well, all the poor who had migrated in consequence of this clearance are tolerably well paid for by the City, under the operation of the Poor Law.

48. That is another question altogether?—We do not get rid of them.

49. Part of the understanding with the City was that they were not to pull down these houses and drive the poor into the rest of the metropolis if they were exempted from the general rate, but that they should employ the ground where the houses were pulled down, for the purpose of erecting artizans' dwellings?—If that was the understanding, we have been trying to act up to it ever since.

Mr. *Torrens.*

50. What do you mean by saying people are amply compensated under the Poor Law?—Under the Common Poor Fund, the City, having lost its poor, contributes to their maintenance in other districts.

51. What is that fund to which you refer?—The Common Poor Fund.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

52. The Metropolitan Common Fund?—The Metropolitan Common Fund.

53. Will you explain to the Committee what you mean?—As the buildings are pulled down, the poor are of course removed from the City, but then, under the Common Fund, the City is assessed and pays a very large sum of money for the maintenance of the poor. We do not get rid of the maintenance of the poor.

54. I understood you to say that the people were compensated; did you not say that?—No; I say they are maintained; we do not get rid of the maintenance of the poor people who are dispossessed by their removal; the honourable Chairman seemed to think that the City was getting rid of its poor without paying for them; that is not the fact; though we lose the poor we still pay for them.

55. You pay for them in your contribution, you mean?—Yes, in our contribution.

56. According to your valuation?—Yes; we pay notwithstanding their removal; I only wish to remind the Committee of that fact.

Mr. *Hastings.*

57. In order to make that point quite clear, let me put this to you; if you contribute to the Metropolitan Poor Law Fund, I presume you are not only paying for your own poor but for the poor of other districts of the metropolis?—Yes, the rateable value of the City contributes to the maintenance of the whole of the poor of the other districts.

Mr. *Hollond.*

58. Are you not under a mistake as to the time when these sites were cleared; I think you told us that they were cleared a year or two ago; is it not four or five years ago?—I think it is about two years ago; it may be more.

59. As I understand, you have not taken advantage of the amending Act of 1879, which enables you to find sites for dwellings elsewhere, and to use the site which has been cleared for commercial purposes?—We did endeavour to do so; I put in a correspondence with the Secretary of State as to that; our efforts were finally overborne; we were not enabled to go on; we endeavoured to bring in some land at Holloway.

60. You have not done that since our Report of last year, have you?—No.

Chairman.

61. The Secretary of State at that time happened to be myself, and I put no obstacle in the way?—No, I rather think you tried to facilitate the matter; but we could not bring it to a successful issue.

Mr. *Hollond.*

62. The area you speak of is the one called Petticoat-square, is it not?—Yes.

63. The one containing 78,000 square feet?—That is the one.

64. It is the Golden-lane area which contains 60,000 square feet that is to be taken for the railway, is it not?—We are in full hope of getting the Petticoat-square site dealt with.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

65. Do you mean for railway purposes?—No; for reinstating the people; we fully believe that we shall get that done.

Mr. *Hollond.*

66. It is the Golden-lane site that is scheduled, as I understand?—The Golden-lane site we should deal with if we could; but, in consequence of its being scheduled for the railway, our hands are tied.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

67. You told the Committee that the City had cleared the ground without the consent of the Home Secretary, and yet they have taken no steps to let their land, have they?—I rather wondered that the honourable Chairman put it in that way; I did not know that we had cleared it without consent.

Chairman.

68. Was it not given in evidence last year?—I think it was done under the scheme; I believe we went the regular way to work with it.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

69. Remembering that the Act of Parliament says that they "shall sell or let" the land as soon as it is cleared, will you kindly tell the Committee why the Commissioners of Sewers have not proceeded to sell it or let it in the usual way?—They have proceeded, but they have not yet been able to do it.

70. You told us you had an offer for the Golden-lane site; I want you to tell the Committee why, having an offer after having issued such advertisements as you thought necessary, you did not accept the price offered at the auction for it?—The price was not good enough.

71. Does the statute say that you are to have any discretion in the matter?—I hope so.

72. The words are, "shall sell or let," are they not?—Yes, and we shall endeavour to sell or let; we must get rid of it.

73. May I ask you whether it is not the fact that the Corporation have erected a large number of dwellings for working people on land which they have bought with their own money, land for which they paid the market price, and that those buildings are paying 4 per cent. to the Corporation?—I believe it is the fact; I went to look at those buildings yesterday, and a very fine block of buildings they are.

74. Then Parliament having directed that a certain site shall be set apart for that purpose, how is it that the Commissioners of Sewers do not proceed with the work, particularly having regard to the fact that previous operations of that kind undertaken by the Corporation are paying 4 per cent.?—Perhaps some one will move the Corporation to take one of these areas; I wish they would.

75. Now, with regard to the Petticoat-square site, is it not a fact that that site is unsaleable because of the enormous tithe to which the buildings when erected upon it would be subject owing to the City Tithe Act?—That was so last year when Parliament settled the tithe, and one reason

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

son why we have delayed has been that we have been hoping that the tithe question would find its level.

76. The Act of Parliament to which you refer was passed last Session; what have the Commissioners of Sewers done since that time with the Petticoat-square site?—They have not moved yet.

77. Is not the sum which Parliament has fixed as a tithe thought to be so large that it will materially prejudice the value of the land for building purposes?—Yes.

78. Even now?—Even now; I believe it prevents offers coming to us. It is one of the most difficult plots of land to deal with that I have ever known.

79. Is it not the fact that Parliament has imposed such a heavy tithe that if the land is let for the purposes for which Parliament says it shall be let, you will have to take what may be considered practically a nominal price for it?—We fear that it is so; and we have become conscious of this, that if that land could be covered with a building on the plans proposed, subject to anything like the restrictions that now exist, that building, when finished, would not be worth one-fourth of its cost.

80. I do not quite understand you; will you explain what you mean by that?—I mean that the building would not be worth one-fourth of its cost when finished, because of the restrictions under which the parties would be placed.

81. Are you referring to buildings to be used as dwellings for the working classes?—Yes.

82. I presume I may take it that you have had sufficient experience in relation to this matter to justify you in expressing such an opinion, when you say that the buildings would not be worth a fourth of their cost?—We were distinctly advised by a professional man that if we put up buildings which would cost 100,000 *l.* (that was at Holloway), and got them filled with tenants and then wanted to sell them, we should not be likely, under the conditions imposed by this Act, to sell them for 25,000 *l.*

83. How do you reconcile that statement with the fact that the Corporation bought land of the Clerkenwell Improvement Trustees, under an Act passed many years ago, paid the trustees the market price for that land, paid for the buildings erected upon it, those buildings being situate in Farringdon Road, and have earned 4 per cent. on the money invested?—I know that is the case.

84. How do you reconcile the two statements?—In this way: the Corporation, as you know, bought that land at a low price, and they are absolutely unfettered. It is within their own discretion as to how they build, and what they build, so long as they conform to the general law.

85. Is it not a fact that they paid to the trustees of the Clerkenwell Improvement the price fixed by two surveyors. I would not suggest that, unless I knew it to be so; but, as a matter of fact, I was a party to the arrangement? Yes; I know you were.

86. Is it not a fact that the buildings put up

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

were of such a character that they would be passed immediately by any public authority?—I think so. I am rather proud of the buildings, but they are their own buildings. They are unfettered absolutely.

87. How do you reconcile the statement that the buildings on the Petticoat-square site would not pay the interest on the cost of the buildings with the fact that you have buildings of the same class paying 4 per cent. not only on the buildings but on the land too?—I must leave you to be a better judge of that than I am.

88. I do not want to judge, but I put the facts to you, and ask you to reconcile them with the inaction of the Commissioners of Sewers at the present time in regard to the Petticoat-square site. They were not under any restriction by Act of Parliament?—I think the drift of your question is to ascertain the reason why the Commissioner of Sewers have not proceeded to build.

89. I want to know why they have not proceeded to abide by the directions of the Statute of 1875?—We are not guilty at all of neglect in this matter. We are using our best wisdom for the purpose of administering the property in our hands.

90. Still, as a fact, the wisdom results in doing nothing?—It results in not having done anything hitherto.

Chairman.

91. That inaction involves an enormous loss, does it not?—It does, but we are the parties who suffer the loss. It is not voluntarily suffered.

92. It involves loss of interest every year?—It involves loss of interest, and that is a very large sum. I daresay it is many thousands of pounds. We do not incur that lightly, and we are using our judgment as men of business as to the right thing to do.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

93. Are you not incurring every year in the loss of rent and the loss of rates to the parishes in which the vacant ground is situated, a sum which in a very few years will absorb whatever value there is in the land?—It is going on very badly, but nevertheless we are not to be forced into taking an insignificant and paltry rental; 410 *l.* has been offered us for one site that cost over 100,000 *l.* We should not be men of business, nor fit to be trusted with the business, if we let it in that way. We had an offer from one of the companies, but we could not accept their rent. We are not to take 3 *d.* a foot in order to plunge headlong into the letting of this land. We must get a proper sum; as one of our duties to ourselves and the ratepayers, we must consider the proper rental.

94. Do you consider the Metropolitan Board of Works were to blame when they took 3 *d.* a foot for one of their sites?—I cannot say.

95. And when they offered, in order to give effect to the Act, to take 20 years' purchase of the rental, do you think they were to blame?—I do not know; I can only say what the Commissioners think; I can only judge as regards them. We do not think 3 *d.* a foot at all a right sum;

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

we should be ashamed to take it. Nor do we consider 20 years' purchase proper. We do not sell at 20 years' purchase.

96. You have told the Committee the poor are compensated by the City?—No.

97. What you mean is that you contribute towards the Common Fund out of which contributions are made to the maintenance of paupers?—I did not use the word "compensate."

98. Is it not a fact that the persons whom Parliament intended to benefit by the erection of these houses were not persons on the rates, but persons who by such assistance might be kept off the rates?—Yes. A very large number whom we cleared out were persons I think who received relief; I had reason to think so.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

99. You said the Metropolitan Board of Works had not let any sites; I suppose you are not aware that we have let six to the Peabody Trustees?—I am very glad of it, but the Board have a good deal not let.

100. I suppose you allow that you made a mistake?—I allow that.

101. You made a mistake in saying the Metropolitan Board of Works had not let?—That they had not let all.

Chairman.

102. Do you not think that it would have been wise on the part of the City when they had found there was a difficulty in letting this land to have turned their attention specially and immediately to these two suggestions, which would at all events have been so much in your favour?—Yes, we shall be before the Secretary of State very quickly about it.

103. That is very much in the future. Why have you not been before the Secretary of State in the last six or nine months?—I think I gave my reason a little time ago. One thing is, that the value of land there is settling down since the tithe question was adjusted, and the other that we hope for the termination of this Committee's labours.

104. That is to say, what you have been rather hoping for is that you may get relieved from this obligation altogether?—No, we have no desire to escape frem the obligation at all.

105. Why do you not act upon it?—We cannot.

106. But surely you have it in your power to apply to the Secretary of State for the relaxation about letting part of it as shops, which would be very much in your favour?—We could have done that, but it would have been an incomplete proceeding. We would rather, if we can, know your decision in the matter.

107. That is to say, practically, you have determined to take no steps until this Committee has finally reported; is that so?—No; the Commission has ordered the Committee to apply to the Secretary of State, and the Committee have delayed doing it for a time, for reasons which seemed to them advisable.

108. Have you given those reasons?—I have given the reasons as near as I can give them.

108.* The only or the main reason is that they

Chairman—continued.

want to wait until they find the decision of this Committee?—I think that is one reason that has a good deal to do with it, I think.

109. Therefore they will take no active steps until this Committee has reported?—In the meantime, if we can get an offer such as the trustees ought to accept, we shall accept it.

110. You cannot expect to get the most advantageous offer if you do not take advantage of our recommendation to apply to the Secretary of State for a relaxation of your obligations?—We fully rely upon having those relaxations when we come to him. We consider them as good as obtained.

111. You cannot put out an advertisement that the land is to be let free from those obligations until you have got the relaxations?—No.

112. Why did you not get them three or four months ago?—Only that in delaying the matter we thought it better to let it stand over for a short time.

113. What would be the amount of your loss in interest on the money in the last six months; what are you losing yearly?—The clerk tells me 8,000*l.* a year. I should think more than that.

114. Surely that ought to press you to get rid of this thing as soon as you can?—It does press us, and therefore I must cast myself upon your good opinion that we endeavour to discharge our duty as wisely as we can, and without any delay that we do not feel we are entitled to make. We cannot do more.

Mr. *Torrens.*

115. Did I understand you to say where the buildings were they had proved so unprofitable as not to be worth one-fourth of their cost, or that you were told they would sell for so much?—That is when we were inquiring about a project of putting up buildings at Holloway, near the Caledonian-road Cattle Market.

116. How long ago was that?—About two or three years ago.

117. Is it since you have been putting up these new buildings in the neighbourhood of the Cattle Market?—We are not putting them up. We were at that time making inquiry, and one professional man, with whom we were talking, said, "I do not believe they would fetch above a fourth-part of their cost."

118. Is it not a fact that you have let the land there, contiguous to this land that you allude to, within the last two years?—That land has been used by the Market Committee since. It is not open for us now.

119. It is not open because it is covered?—Exactly.

120. Has it not been covered in defiance of the opinions of the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, as was represented to you, I believe, unsuccessfully, or to your Board, in contravention with the agreement made with Parliament that it should be kept open?—That I do not know; I am not in the market.

121. Did you never hear of that?—No.

122. You never heard of it?—No.

123. Are you aware there was a dispute as to their territory all round the buildings you now describe as comparatively worthless, and disputes

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

putes between the locality and the Commissioners of Sewers as regards the matter, which prevented the land being so excessively overcovered?—No; I think those matters have been rather in the hands of the Markets Committee and Corporation, and my attention has been wholly given to the Commissioners of Sewers. I do not know of those matters at all.

124. Was the depreciated value which you quoted to the Committee to-day consequent or contingent upon the excessive building which has been going on in the neighbourhood of the market?—It was a mere theoretical statement by a professional man, and I do not know on what he grounded it.

125. Can you tell the Committee the quality of the houses generally speaking, whether good, bad, or indifferent, that have been raised all round that original structure in that neighbourhood?—I do not know it; I have never seen them.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

126. Have the Commissioners of Sewers formed any opinion as to what price they would or ought to accept for this land?—Scarcely, I think. We should consider each offer, and have considered every offer that has been made.

127. But you have considered the offers too small?—Yes.

128. What I want to know is, what loss the Commissioners are ready to incur upon their purchase, or what loss they think they would be justified in incurring?—I am not prepared to say.

129. It is quite clear that they will incur a loss, if they sell subject to these conditions?—Yes; we know that.

130. What is the amount of loss they are ready to submit to?—I am not prepared to say.

Chairman.

131. They are prepared to lose 8,000*l.* a year for some time, at all events?—Unfortunately, we have to do that.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

132. I think you say last year the two highest offers you had were 700*l.* for one and 550*l.* for the other, and since then you have not had so high an offer?—No; the only offer we have received I have handed in.

133. And apart from the restrictions of the Act you told us just now the land would sell at 2*s.* a foot. You are speaking of the rental, I presume?—I feel sure it would.

134. If you disposed of the land at that rate, you would recoup your purchase even now, would you not?—I think so, but that is a matter of calculation.

135. Assuming it is 111,000 square feet, it would produce 11,000*l.* a year, would it not?—That is a question of calculation; I daresay you have worked it correctly.

136. How much of that difference between the 1,200*l.* a year and 11,000*l.* a year which you might realise are the Commissioners of Sewers of the City prepared to sacrifice?—I cannot tell you. We know we shall sacrifice a good deal of it.

137. Are they prepared to sacrifice three-fourths of it?—I do not think I ought to say, because it is a question they must determine. We know we shall make a loss, but we are trying to do the best we can. The clerk tells me I made a slip in calling the Golden-lane site the larger area. The Petticoat-square site is the larger area, if you will allow that to be corrected.

Chairman.

138. I understood that was so?—I did not know that I had so stated it.

Mr. FREDERICK WILLIAM GODDARD, called in; and Examined.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

139. How long have you been in the service of the Board, and what has been and is your position?—I have been in the service of the Board nearly 20 years; I am entering on my 20th year; my position is chief surveyor and valuer to the Board.

140. Have you not had the duty of advising the Board in all claims to compensation under the Streets Improvement and Artizans' Acts?—I think about 7,000,000*l.* has been the amount of money that has passed through my hands, so far as dealing with the properties is concerned.

141. Will you now explain to the Committee what steps the Board has taken with reference to the suggestions in the interim report, dated 2nd August 1881, as to the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act; will you state what progress has been made in clearing the various areas?—I prepared a short statement here, which, with the permission of the Chairman, I will read: "On the 5th August last the Board referred the interim report of the Select Committee to the Works Committee, with power to act, and that committee subsequently gave instructions for the

Sir *J. M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

clearance of certain areas, subject to the consent of the Secretary of State, which was given in due course." Application was made to the Secretary of State, who gave us a relaxation of the permission to pull down houses that had been condemned as dangerous or unsanitary. "The committee also applied for, and ultimately obtained, a relaxation by the Secretary of State of certain conditions in the Provisional Orders confirming the schemes which were found by experience to trammel the Board and the intended lessees to such an extent as to interfere with and act as an additional difficulty in letting the land. Instructions were given to the engineer and architect to bring up plans and particulars showing any vacant sites or blocks of buildings which were likely to be available for the accommodation of artizans displaced, and also showing the facilities of access by railway or other means of cheap transit. The clerk and the superintending architect also applied, by direction of the committee, to the local authorities in the suburban districts, and to the district surveyor, for information as to the number of vacant cottages

Sir *J. M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

available for artizans, and as to the provision made for the poorer classes relatively to the increase of the general population. By this means a large amount of information has been collected, and has been printed in a tabulated form for the use of members of the Board. The committee also considered the question of the desirability of selling the future sites out-and-out, or letting them on building leases; and having regard to the expressions of dissatisfaction by the Select Committee as to the stringency of the conditions hitherto adopted, decided to sell the land out-and-out, with a covenant by the purchaser to erect and continue artizans' dwellings for 10 years from the date of the conveyance, with power to the Board to re-enter in case of breach of the covenant. Conditions of sale on this basis have been prepared in respect of the High-street, Islington, and the St. George-the-Martyr, Southwark, schemes, and have recently been forwarded to the Home Office for approval; and similar conditions of sale are ready in respect of the unsold portion of the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme; I may say that these conditions have been sent to the Home Secretary, and I believe, with a slight alteration, they have been approved. A portion also of the area comprised in the Essex-road (Islington) scheme will shortly be ready for clearance.

142. Was there not some delay beyond the time mentioned in the conditions of sale in getting the purchasers to remove the materials? —Where you put a large quantity of material into the market (as was the case here, on account of the immense number of houses we had to remove), there becomes a glut of that specific material, and although we enforce a rigid adherence to the conditions of sale as far as we can, it is most difficult to get the brick buyers, called house breakers, to pull the houses down according to the strict terms enforced in the conditions of sale, and it is only sometimes absolutely by the loans of money on the part of the auctioneer who sells that they are enabled to clear the ground at all; but we have been enabled to do so within a reasonable time, say a couple of months after the time specified.

143. You have no further reasons to give with regard to the delay than those you have given? —No.

144. Are you aware that the Board proposes to sell these sites by public auction under revised conditions of sale?—Similar conditions to those which the Board submitted on the 20th January last; the two sites, one of which I think Sir Sydney Waterlow's Company bought, and the other was bought by Mr. Foskett; and I put those in evidence.

145. Will not the revised conditions give a more general appeal to the Secretary of State upon matters in difference, and provide that the obligations to continue labourers' dwellings on the sites shall not be perpetual, but only for 10 years?—Yes.

146. Have you a table showing the position of the Board in relation to the several schemes for which Provisional Orders have been obtained? —Yes. This is "a statement showing the position of the Board in relation to the several artizans' schemes for which Provisional Orders have been obtained, prepared 1st March 1882. (1.) Whitechapel and Limehouse—all east of railway—new buildings erected and occupied." That was before the Act. "All west of railway: ground cleared and will be offered for sale immediately. (2.) Bedfordbury: new buildings completed and occupied."

147. May we have the area of the ground cleared?—I will give that.

Chairman.

148. You will put that in?—I will put that in. "(3.) Great Wild-street, ditto. Old Pye-street: new buildings erected on artizans' land; also on commercial land (600 persons are to be accommodated on the latter); the buildings will very shortly be ready for occupation." The Board have sacrificed that land in order to accommodate 600 additional persons. "(5.) Pear Tree-court: possession given to trustees 10th May 1881, but no buildings erected or commenced. This applies also to commercial land, possession of which was given to trustees, 25th June 1881." There has been some correspondence between the Home Secretary and our Board with regard to the alteration and adaptation of these blocks of buildings, and the plans are now altered and in the office, and will shortly be carried out. "(6.) Whitecross-street. The entirety of the site has been cleared, and some part built on. The remainder of the land agreed to be sold to trustees will be handed over in the course of this month." At the close of this month that will be complete. "(7.) High-street, Islington. All cleared, and about to be sold by auction. (8.) St. George-the-Martyr." There are three areas there, and the same course is adopted. "(9.) Goulston-street and Flower and Dean-street—thirteen weeks' notice given" (we are bound to give, as you know, notice to all the tenants) "in respect of 207 houses expired on 22nd February 1882. Most of the interests in the remainder of the property included in the scheme have been acquired." I may explain that. It is not when I or the arbitrator settles the price to be paid that we can call it an acquisition of the property; it is when all interests have been examined and all inquiries have been made as to title by the solicitor of the Board, and the money is absolutely paid to the owner. "(10.) Essex-road Scheme — part between Britannia-row and Anglers'-gardens has been cleared," and that will be submitted to public auction in the usual way, "63 houses now being demolished. The 13 weeks' notice for all remaining houses in the area was issued 9th February 1882. (11.) Bowman's-buildings" (Marylebone), "13 weeks' notice in respect of entire area expired 26th January 1882. Materials advertised for sale on 9th March 1882. (12.) Great Peter-street, Westminster" (that is a small additional scheme)—"only one claim outstanding; schedule will be sent to Home Office next week. (13.) Little Coram-street Scheme—Sir H. A. Hunt appointed standing arbitrator; provisional award not yet made. (14.) Wells-street, Poplar—Mr. R. C. Driver appointed standing arbitrator; provisional award

Chairman—continued.

award made 27th December, 1881," and the appeals are now being heard, several of them being taken this week. Those are the whole of the 14 schemes that the Board have taken in hand, and the larger portion, as you see, have been thoroughly dealt with, and the land is fit for building upon.

149. Have not the engineer and yourself, under the instructions of the Board, prepared some statistics as to the means of transit for the labouring classes by means of tramway, omnibus, and steamboat, and also as to particulars of cottages in the outskirts of the metropolis; and will you hand in such returns, and explain whether they are of a complete character?—Those returns, namely, accommodation available for occupation by the working classes, I may say I cannot arrive at with completeness, because there are some additional houses that are not given, but it is reliable so far as regards the information it does give, namely, it shows the houses that exist that are occupied and that are unoccupied.

150. All available for the use of the artizans?—All available for the use of the artizans.

151. Have you any further information to give with regard to what you have said as to Sections 1, 2, 3 of the Interim Report of this Committee to the House of Commons last year, or do you think you have said all you wish to say?—Well, irrespective of that which I am commanded not to give evidence upon at present, I think I have said all that I have to say.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

152. You said that application had been made to the Secretary of State for his assent to certain modifications; one of those modifications being that there should be only a term of 10 years in regard to these areas. Does that apply to the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—Yes.

153. And his assent has been given, I understand?—That consent has been given.

Mr. *Balfour.*

154. Can you give any estimate of the number of people you expect to accommodate?—Yes, I will give you all that data.

Mr. *Hollond.*

155. I understand you have not used the Amending Act of 1879 at all for getting other sites for the persons displaced by these particular schemes?—We had to consider the interpretation of that Amending Act, as to how far a distance it would allow us to remove them. If it be within what you might call walking distance, it is a most difficult thing to find any spot that was not otherwise as crowded as perhaps the spots we were dealing with, but we have made inquiry within an outer radius. We put advertisements in the paper through a professional gentleman, so that it should not be supposed they were connected with our Board, and we had various sites submitted to us, but we had extreme difficulty in finding anything that would really accommodate the persons displaced.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

156. Were not you and other officers instructed by the Board to do everything you could to find sites?—We were, and we did.

157. And you brought up a good many?—We did.

Mr. *Hollond.*

158. You are aware that a liberal interpretation was recommended by this Committee to be put upon the Amending Act?—The liberal interpretation we have taken is a radius of three miles; I do not know whether that is sufficient.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

159. You read from this statement, "No. 7, High-street, Islington; all cleared and about to be sold by auction." May I ask you whether that is likely to be sold by auction, subject to the same conditions as were issued by the Board on the 20th January this year?—Exactly.

160. You told us, in answer to a question of one honourable Member, that the period of time during which the lessor or purchaser was to retain the buildings for the use of the working classes had been reduced from 80 years to 10 years?—Yes, 10 years.

161. Has your Board considered the danger of such a short period, inasmuch as at the end of 10 years all those buildings which Parliament has intended shall be for the use of the working classes may be converted, or if I may use the word, perverted, to other purposes?—We believe this: the Board very maturely and very deliberately considered the objections which you are raising, but upon considering another fact that buildings devoted to artizans and developed in the manner in which the Industrial Dwellings Company have developed theirs, and the Peabody Trustees have put theirs, would be most difficult to convert into any mercantile house without pulling the whole building down, it seemed to them that if they were to restrict it to 10 years it would give a reasonable time in which the man would find the adaptability of that site to the purpose to which it was devoted, and supposing that the mercantile state of that particular locality was so thoroughly altered in 30 or 40 years, then it might be that upon application its devotion to the absolute thing might be put on one side.

162. Is it not possible easily to convert buildings with external balconies into mercantile uses by taking down the partitions of the houses using the balconies as landing stages for goods, and using the rooms for warehouses; and would it not be in the interest of any purchaser so to convert them, looking at the great difference between mercantile value and the value for dwellings for the working classes?—No, I think not.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

162.* Will you put in the "Conditions of Sale," relating to the three areas that you mentioned?—(*The same was handed in.*)

Chairman.

163. Will you also hand in the two reports of the engineers and the architect to which you have referred?—(*The same were handed in.*)

2 *March* 1882.

Mr. JOHN CROUCH, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

164. IN what capacity do you represent the Peabody Trustees?—I am the secretary.

165. Would you be kind enough to state to the Committee exactly what has been done by the Peabody Trustees since this Committee broke up at the end of last Session?—I have prepared a short statement in writing, which I will put in evidence.

166. Be good enough to read it, please?—"Since Midsummer last the trustees have completed the erection of five blocks of buildings, containing 362 rooms, at Bedfordbury, and 13 blocks, containing 808 rooms at Great Wild-street. They have also commenced the building of fifteen blocks, containing 864 rooms, on the old Pye-street site, and of six blocks, containing 300 rooms, at Whitecross-street. The Bedfordbury buildings were tenanted in September and November last, and the Great Wild-street buildings are now being let, and will be fully occupied by the middle of the present month. The blocks at Old Pye-street will be ready for occupation about Midsummer, and those at Whitecross-street towards the end of the year. A modification of the Old Pye-street scheme has been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, and applications for further modifications of the Whitecross-street and Pear Tree-court schemes are under consideration."

Chairman—continued.

167. When, in your opinion, will the whole of the scheme taken up by the Peabody Trustees be covered by buildings?—I should say by Midsummer, 1883.

168. The whole of them?—I should say so.

169. Are you building as rapidly as you can at the present moment?—Not, perhaps, at the present moment quite so rapidly as we might have gone on. We are waiting for the sanction for modifications at Whitecross-street and Pear Tree-court, but we are in other places building as rapidly as we can.

170. Do you refer to sanction from the Secretary of State?—From the Secretary of State.

171. Is there any other matter which has delayed you except that?—No other matter.

172. Nothing?—Nothing.

Monday, 6th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Balfour.
Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Right Hon. Sir Richard Cross.
Viscount Emlyn.
Sir Henry T. Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Right Hon. G. J. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.
Sir Sydney Waterlow.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Sir HENRY ARTHUR HUNT, C.B., was called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

173. YOU are, I believe, a practising surveyor, and your offices are in Parliament-street, London?—Yes.

174. You have been in practice on your own account for upwards of 52 years, I believe?—I have.

175. How long have you been consulting surveyor to Her Majesty's Office of Works?—Twenty-six years.

176. You have had considerable experience in compensation cases under the Lands Clauses Act and the Public Health Acts?—I have.

177. I believe you have, for a long time, ceased to appear as a witness in such cases?—I have.

178. And therefore your business for many years has been in acting as umpire in arbitration cases?—It has.

179. And in that capacity, I believe, you have a large, if not a larger practice, than any other person in England?—I believe I have the largest practice.

180. You have acted as standing arbitrator under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875, in how many cases?—Altogether 15.

181. How many in London?—Eight.

182. How many in the provinces?—Seven.

183. And besides that you have one scheme in London, Little Coram-street, now on hand, I believe?—I have.

184. Judging from experience which you have had of the Act, in your opinion, at the present moment, has it worked generally beneficially?—I think it has worked most beneficially in the public interest.

185. I believe you have got a schedule that you can put in, showing the date of your appointment in the different cases, the date of publication of your provisional and final awards, the aggregate sums awarded in respect of each scheme, and your costs?—Yes. (*The same was handed in.*)

186. Before I ask you generally as to the Act, have you any observations which you wish to make to the Committee on this schedule?—The only observation I desire to make upon that schedule is that the first scheme on the list, the Whitechapel scheme, was from first to last 12 months in hand. It has been mentioned to the Committee before, and I should like to explain the reason why that took so long a time. It arises from this, that there was a delay of about three months, as the honourable Baronet, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, will recollect.

Chairman—continued.

187. This is the one on the east side of the railway, is it not?—On both sides.

188. The whole of it is included in this?—Yes. In that case the Metropolitan Board of Works desired to have the scheme modified, so as to prevent a person having a very large property there, compelling them to take the whole. The scheme was modified in order to avoid imposing a heavy cost upon them, and that took two or three months to accomplish. Otherwise the award would have been made in less time. As regards the charges, which you will see in the last column, which I made in every one of those cases, I have only to observe that, except in the case of Wolverhampton, I am not aware of any exception having been taken to my charges. The Corporation of Wolverhampton did object, and appealed to the Local Government Board. However, the Local Government Board said that they had no jurisdiction over my costs, and upon looking at the Act of Parliament I venture to say that they were right; and in any modification of the Act I would suggest that the arbitrator's charges should, beyond doubt, be supervised by the confirming authority under the Act.

189. You refer to the 28th section of the Schedule of the first Act?—Yes.

190. Which enacts, that "The salary or remuneration, travelling, and other expenses of the arbitrator, and all costs, charges, and expenses (if any) which may be incurred by the confirming authority in carrying the provisions of this Act into execution, shall be paid by the local authority, and the amount of such costs, charges, and expenses shall from time to time be certified by the confirming authority"?—Yes; it is held by the Local Government Board that the costs of the arbitrator are not included in those words. The "costs, charges, expenses," I take it, must mean "costs, charges, and expenses" incurred by the local authority in putting the Act in operation. In fact there ought to be, I think, a colon or a semicolon after the word arbitrator.

191. You would recommend, in any alteration of

Chairman—continued.

of the Act, that the costs of the arbitrator should be subject to the confirming authority?—Quite so. I should say that the Wolverhampton Corporation, finding that they had no appeal to the confirming authority, paid my account in full. That is the only case in which I have heard of any exception being taken to my charges.

192. Then I will ask you now to give to the Committee, if you will be good enough to do so, your views upon the Acts, and state any alteration you would suggest to be made in the Acts as they stand?—According to the experience which I have had in the working out of these schemes, I think that the exercise of the powers has resulted in great advantage to the public in clearing away unhealthy areas of unwholesome habitations. No doubt it has been done at a considerable cost to the ratepayers, but that must be the case with regard to all improvements in the metropolis and other crowded cities. New streets, for example, the Thames Embankment, and other improvements in the metropolis, cannot as a rule be effected without a considerable loss to the ratepayers, particularly in districts like these, where the houses are packed so closely together. At the same time, I am of opinion that the machinery of the Act and the mode of proceeding is too cumbrous, too dilatory, and too expensive. I venture to suggest a simpler and more summary course of action. This is what I venture to suggest: that upon the receipt of the medical officer's representation, in regard to an unhealthy area, the local authority, with the consent of the confirming authority, shall prepare plans of the area, and serve a notice on every owner or reputed owner, lessee or reputed lessee, of the intention of the local authority to obtain power to take the land compulsorily, and inquiring whether the person so served assents or dissents, and requesting him to forward to the local authority a statement setting forth any objections he may have to his land being taken. The confirming authority shall, after the service of such notices, make a local inquiry by a competent officer into the objections of any person whose land is required to be taken, and by other persons, if any, interested in the subject matter of such inquiry. The confirming authority, if satisfied after such inquiry has been made that the land ought to be taken, may order the scheme to be carried out, and such order shall have the same effect as if it had received the sanction of Parliament, or, if thought better, it might be done by an Order in Council, or some other machinery or tribunal more prompt in action than going before Parliament. This mode of proceeding follows very much an Act of Parliament that was passed last Session, called the Post Office (Land) Act, which empowers the Postmaster General at any time in the year to put the Act in operation very much in the way that I have suggested; in fact, the wording that I have read to you is taken from that Act so far as it applies. The only difference is that under this Act of which I am speaking (the Post Office (Land) Act, 1881), Parliament has to confirm the Provisional Order. I suggest that as Parliament, by the Act of 1875, amended by the Act of 1879, sanctions the principle of clearing away these plague spots in unhealthy districts, the objections, if any, will be sufficiently considered by the confirming authority, or by any other tribunal which the Committee may think fit to recommend. At present you have to apply to Parliament, and go through all the procedure provided for by the Standing Orders, which would be avoided in this case as it will be avoided in the Post Office (Land) Act.

Chairman—continued.

193. Do I correctly understand you to mean that by the Acts of 1875 and 1879 Parliament has sanctioned the compulsory taking of property which is absolutely injurious to health, under the provisions of those two Acts, and that principle being laid down, in your opinion the only thing which remains is a fair question of evidence whether a certain spot comes within the provisions of those Acts or not?—Yes, that is my view.

194. And that so far as that point of evidence goes, that need not be presented to Parliament, but might be settled elsewhere?—It might be settled by the Home Secretary, or by an Order in Council, or by some other ready mode, instead of by going to Parliament and having probably to meet some factious opposition and so delay the passing of the Act.

195. Still in the Post Office Act to which you have referred there has to be a confirming scheme to Parliament, has there not?—No; no scheme is required. The Post Office (Land) Act gives exactly what I have read to you. I will read it to you again, if you will give me leave: "Three months at the least before an application is made to Parliament for sanction to the compulsory purchase of land under this Act" (and I should tell you that this Act does not require a deposit of plans as the Act of 1875 and other private Acts do, but it sanctions, as I read it, the Postmaster General's saying, "I want your property for the public service, and I give you three months' notice that I intend to do certain things which are to be submitted to Parliament for their sanction"), "the Postmaster General with the consent of the Treasury shall serve in manner provided by the said incorporated Acts" (those are the Lands Clauses Acts) "a notice on every owner, or reputed owner, lessee, or reputed lessee, and occupier of any land intended to be so purchased, describing the land intended to be taken, and in general terms the purposes to which it is to be applied, and stating the intention of the Treasury to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the purchase thereof, and inquiring whether the person so served assents or dissents to the taking of his land, and requesting him to forward to the Treasury any objections he may have to his land being taken." And I substitute for that my suggestion, "the confirming authority." Then, "the Treasury shall at some time after the service of such notice make a local inquiry by a competent officer into the objections made by any persons whose land is required to be taken and by other persons, if any, interested in the subject matter of such inquiry. The Treasury, if satisfied, after such inquiry has been made, that the land ought to be taken, may submit a Bill to Parliament containing provisions authorising the Postmaster General to take such land, and such Bill

Chairman—continued.

Bill shall in all respects be deemed to be a public Bill, and if passed into an Act to have conveyed the sanction of Parliament to the purchase compulsorily of the land therein mentioned or referred to, and the period for such compulsory purchase shall be three years after the passing of such Act."

196. Then there was to be an Act of Parliament there, but it was to be a public Act?—A public Act and a confirming Act, because this Act of Parliament would range over the whole country, and under it property might be taken of a valuable kind in a most important thoroughfare. I had very great experience during the duration of my official connection with the Office of Works (and all those Post Office questions came before me) of the difficulty the Postmaster General is under in acquiring property, except at exorbitant prices, for the carrying on of the postal service. I think this is one of the most useful Acts in the interest of the public that has been passed.

197. When the local authority has received power to proceed with the scheme, what would they do?—The mode of proceeding I suggest follows very much the Post Office (Land) Act of 1881, except that the Provisional Order has to be confirmed by a Bill in Parliament, the delay in obtaining which, as I said before, it seems to me, might be avoided, seeing that Parliament by the Act of 1875 and the amending Act of 1879 sanctioned the principle of clearing away these plague spots and unhealthy districts in large cities and towns. When the local authority shall have received power to proceed with the scheme, they should then serve notices to treat and agree upon all the owners, lessees, and occupiers in the manner prescribed by the Lands Clauses Act, and upon receipt of the claims they should endeavour to effect a settlement with the various claimants; but failing to do so the claimant, supposing he has a greater interest than an agreement for three years, should elect whether he desires his case to be determined by a jury or by a standing arbitrator to be named by the confirming authority before he has to elect, so that he may know who the standing arbitrator is to be. If he elected to go before a standing arbitrator, then all parties must abide the result and have no appeal whatever.

198. There is no appeal to a jury after that?—No; he has had the option, according to my view, of selecting the tribunal which he thinks would do him most justice, and he makes his election with the knowledge that A. B. or C. D. is the appointed standing arbitrator in the case. Therefore if he has the choice of going to a jury in the first instance, and he elects to go before an arbitrator he should be placed in no better position than a claimant is under the Lands Clauses Act, who must abide by the decision of the arbitrator unless there is something informal in the proceedings. This, I think, will simplify the proceedings very much, and will to a certain extent prevent the manufacture of agreements, and prevent useless and unnecessary expenditure upon the property with a view to increase the compensation as the notice to treat and agree would be a contract between the parties, and we

Chairman—continued.

know that, under the law, anything done after a notice is given to treat and agree is done at the peril of the person doing it. All interests, which by the proposed clause are not to be decided by a jury, must be dealt with by the standing arbitrator, whose decision must be final. If claimants, however, neglect or refuse to appear before the arbitrator and prosecute fully their claims, the standing arbitrator should be empowered to proceed *ex parte*, and make his award accordingly, without any power of appeal by either party. I can tell you what happened in reference to the scheme at Birmingham. It was one of the large cases. The parties appealed against my provisional award. I gave them notice to attend that I might hear their appeal. A great many of them declined. They said: "It is out of no disrespect to you, but we do not choose to expose our hand; if you should not give us enough in a final award, we do not want to be prejudiced by having our case known to the local authority before we go before a jury;" so that they frustrated the operations of the Act, and instead of going before the standing arbitrator upon their appeal they were obliged to take the local authority before a jury. Therefore I do not want in those cases, if my suggestion should be thought worthy of consideration, that we should be left in the power of any claimant so that he could say, "I elected to go before the arbitrator, but I have altered my mind; I will not now go before the arbitrator." Then, I think, he ought to be made to abide by the decision of the arbitrator if he is so foolish as not to appear and state his case to him. He has had an opportunity of going before a jury if he had been so minded.

199. Then if he neglects to elect either one way or the other, you think he ought to come before the arbitrator?—If he neglects either one way or the other, then the power would be in the local authority to give him notice for a jury, and if he did not appear there the jury would give a verdict according to the evidence put forward by the local authority; but in the case that I am looking at he first of all says, "I elect to go before the arbitrator," and then at the last moment he says, "I shall not give any evidence."

200. You stated just now that the notice to treat would do away with a good deal that has been going on as to getting amendments in relation to the property which has been scheduled, or making agreements?—I know that the Metropolitan Board of Works felt that very much, and a representation was made by them to the Home Office in order to prevent this expenditure of money, and the Home Office did me the honour to consult me about that, and I advised this: This is not like a Railway Bill; there is no notice to treat and agree here, therefore the claimant has no certainty that his property will be taken. It would be very hard, therefore, to impose restrictions upon him without his being able to compel the local authority to buy his property. Therefore what I say now is, if the local authority give a notice to treat and agree, and he chooses to spend 200*l.* or 300*l.* upon his house with a view to getting compensation, he

Chairman—continued.

does it at his own peril. The jury or the standing arbitrator may say, "You have done this on purpose to put the local authority to unnecessary and needless expense, and we will not allow it."

201. This plan which you propose would do away with the provisional award altogether?—Quite so.

202. The arbitrator would only make one award?—The arbitrator would make only one award, which would be final.

203. I see in the paper you put before us that the difference between your provisional award and the final award, taking the whole of the schemes together, is that the provisional awards amount to 1,142,305 *l.* and the final awards amount to 1,196,789 *l.*?—Yes. You will see by the statement, which I have put in, that some of my provisional awards have been increased and some diminished. Of course the provisional award is made entirely upon an *ex parte* consideration; you have not all the facts before you and you have no evidence.

204. But the difference is only about 50,000 *l.* in this large sum?—That is all. The Committee are aware that every one of my awards above 500 *l.* was subject to an appeal to a jury. I have not followed the cases that have gone before juries, but I am told that there are only six cases out of the schemes promoted by the Metropolitan Board of Works in which appeals to a jury have been made.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

205. Do you mean out of all the schemes?—Out of all the schemes under the Metropolitan Board of Works. The City scheme (Golden-lane and Petticoat-lane) are under the Commissioners of Sewers. I do not know how many jury cases there have been in connection with those, but I think very few.

Chairman.

206. But in the Metropolitan Board schemes that came before you there were only six appeals I understand?—There were only six appeals.

207. Have you got the results there?—Yes, I have got the results here.

208. Perhaps you will let the Committee know what they are?—One case was that of Miss Jones, who held some property in Whitecross-street. That was a comparatively modern building, originally intended, I believe, as dwellings for the working classes. It did not seem to me to be within the scope of the unhealthy area, and the result was this: that the amount of claim was 11,000 *l.*, the amount of my award was 6,500 *l.*, and the result of the appeal to the jury was a verdict for 5,000 *l.*

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

209. Was it an appeal by the Metropolitan Board or by the claimant?—By the Board. There was another case in Whitecross-street, also an appeal by the Board. That was Snelling's case, and referred to two plots of freehold land in London-court. The claim was 4,600 *l.*, and the

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

award 1,650 *l.*; the verdict of the jury was 1,700 *l.* I should tell you that by the Act of Parliament the jury are precluded from knowing the amount of the arbitrator's final award. The next case was an appeal by George Dutton, a claimant in Bedfordbury. The property was freehold; 5,000 *l.* was the amount of the claim, the amount of award was 1,600 *l.*; the result of the jury case was 1,600 *l.*, the same figure. Then there is another case in Old Pye-street, Hewitt's case; that was the claimant's appeal. The claim was 3,000 *l.*; the award was 800 *l.* The claimant went to a jury, and the jury awarded him 675 *l.* That was a less amount on the claimant's appeal. Then a man of the name of Mein, in Whitecross-street, made a claim in respect of a long leasehold term of 77 years. The amount of the claim was 5,425 *l.*; the amount of the award was 2,900 *l.*, and the result of the appeal was that the jury gave 2,750 *l.* That was a claimant's appeal, not the appeal of the Board. There was another case, the Churchwardens of St. Luke's, in Whitecross-street. The amount of the claim was 1,677 *l.*; my award was 650 *l.*; the jury gave a verdict of 900 *l.* Those are all the jury cases that I know of.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

210. Was that the claimant's appeal or the Board's?—The claimant's.

Chairman.

211. What was the result as to costs in all those cases?—I cannot tell you that.

212. Who would pay the costs?—There is a provision in the Act of Parliament, I think, relating to it. I do not know anything at all about the appeals to the jury in the other cases, either in London or in the country; but if you think fit to call anybody from these other places, it would be very instructive to have from them a similar table to that from which I have now just read.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

213. Were there any jury cases in Birmingham?—Yes; many, I think.

Chairman.

214. Under the present system, in your opinion, it takes about two years from the date of the medical officer's representation until the final award is published?—As near as I can tell. The honourable Baronet, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, will know that a great deal better than I do. It cannot be very much less.

215. How long do you think it would take under your scheme?—I should think nine or ten months, if you had not to go to Parliament to have it confirmed. If you have it confirmed by the confirming authority I should think it might be done in nine or ten months, because there is not the least necessity, as in the Post Office Act, to give three months' notice, and although the owners of those properties are, according to my view of the Act, to be paid fair and reasonable compensation,

Chairman—continued.

compensation, I do not see any great hardship in their being turned out of the possession of their property by an Act of Parliament in a more speedy way than under the ordinary law of the land. However, that is a matter of detail.

216. I think you desire to say something about the 92nd Section of the Lands Clauses Act?—Yes.

217. Perhaps you will just explain that section, as some of the members of the Committee may not be familiar with it?—The members of the Committee know that, under the 92nd section of the Lands Clauses Act, if you take a part of a man's property the courts of law, if proper representation is made to them, and they think it is a proper case, compel you to take the whole; but at the same time if the court decides that you must take the whole, it is competent then for the promoters to withdraw the notice altogether, and to say, "I will not take any part." In other cases it is not competent to them to do so. After a notice to treat has been served, the promoters must go on; but in a case like that I have put, they can withdraw the notice and so escape the operation of the 92nd section. It has been pressed upon me in the various schemes that I have had to deal with, that this 92nd section ought to be brought into operation, and that the local authority ought to take a much larger extent of property than they require for their scheme. Acting under the advice of my solicitor, I have refused to recognise the 92nd section, and have allowed the claimant (and have awarded accordingly) any damage that he might sustain by having a portion of his property taken away from him. The local authority under the Act of 1875 could not elect, as the promoters of an ordinary undertaking have the power to elect, to withdraw the notice for a part, because they are bound hand and foot by the scheme, and by the directions of the Home Secretary, to carry out the scheme, which is tinted a certain colour on plan. Therefore, the Metropolitan Board of Works, or other local authority, cannot exercise the option which an ordinary company or the promoters of an undertaking could do. Now I want to suggest that in any amended Act it should be enacted that the operation of such a clause as that 92nd section should not be put in force.

218. You mean that people should not have the power of claiming for the whole of the property?—Yes. The amending Act of 1879, which deals with the 92nd section, in accordance with one of the suggestions I ventured to make to the Home Secretary, gives the arbitrator the power which I had exercised without authority; but then it is guarded and fenced about by giving the claimant, notwithstanding, power to go to a jury to decide whether the arbitrator has acted justly or unjustly in so deciding. I do not think a claimant ought to have that power.

219. You would exclude the operation of the 92nd clause altogether?—Altogether.

220. And not give the owner of the property power to claim for the whole property if only a part was wanted?—Certainly; that is my view. In considering the amendment of the Act, I may say this: when I was first appointed I took counsels' opinion as to the general scope of the Act, and sought advice as to my course of proceeding, and I got it accordingly; but counsel volunteered advice to me for which I did not ask; the late Lord Justice Thesiger, who was then at the bar, Mr. Chapman Barber, and Mr. Frank Pownall, were the counsel who advised me, and they gave an opinion to this effect: that the Act of Parliament did not authorise the arbitrator to give any compensation for trades, and that, in point of fact, all I had to do was to value the property; that did not commend itself to my sense of justice, and I did not think that the Act of Parliament ever intended that a man should be turned out of his premises, where he was carrying on his business, without compensation; and I thought it my duty, therefore, to include trade compensation in my awards, leaving it for the local authorities to contest my interpretation of the Act of Parliament, rather than throw it upon the owners of property to fight the question for themselves; I do not know how the question has been dealt with in jury cases, and I do not know what the Metropolitan Board of Works have done with reference to those cases; but in the evidence put before me by the Metropolitan Board of Works all the elements of a valuation for trade compensation, such as an accountant's statement, and all that sort of thing, have been brought forward, as if they recognised that trades should be compensated for; at Birmingham, I think they have, in some cases, tested the question before a jury; but I cannot tell you the result; in any amended Act of Parliament, with reference to schemes of this sort, I think it should be made clear what is the intention of the Legislature with reference to that element of compensation; I have thought it my duty in nearly all the cases that have been referred to me, in London, by the Home Secretary, and in the country by the Local Government Board, to let the legal advisers of the several corporations see that opinion; I think my solicitor supplied them with a copy of it in order that they might be put in possession of the fact that I was really acting against the advice of counsel as to the law of the case, so that they might take any steps they thought fit.

221. How did you deal with the small shopkeeper in some of the crowded streets?—It would depend upon his holding; I should give him compensation, certainly.

222. And how do you deal with the costermonger?—I deal in the same way with the costermonger if he is carrying on a trade: unless he was carrying on a trade I should not give him any compensation; I would give him a 5 *l.* note, perhaps, or something of that kind.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

223. The question whether compensation should be given for trade profits turns upon the construction of the 19th section of the Act of 1875, does it not?—I do not know what clause in the Act of Parliament it is fixed upon; I desire also to state that in the Birmingham scheme the corporation objected to my awarding any compensation to a certain class of leaseholders; they had acquired the freehold, and it appeared to me that they desired to let the lease

Sir *H. T. Holland*—continued.

lease run out, and so prevent the lessee obtaining compensation; I thought that was not quite fair to the lessee, because he was included in the scheme; I thought also that, as standing arbitrator appointed to settle the claims of all the persons included in the scheme, I was bound to include their cases, leaving the Corporation of Birmingham to fight the question afterwards; upon that occasion I took the opinion of Sir John Holker, Mr. Webster, and Mr. Pownall, and they advised me that I was bound in my award to give these several leaseholders compensation; I mention this, because in any revision of the Act, it may be well to consider whether a local authority, using an Act of Parliament like this, should not be bound, with as much dispatch as possible, to compensate everybody who has an interest; because if you wait and let a man's lease run out, you, in acquiring the freehold, are preventing him from making terms which otherwise he might, and in all probability would, make with his landlord for a new lease, or a continuance of his term; I have nothing more to say upon that, except that I think the point is worthy of consideration.

Chairman.

224. I believe, so far as regards isolated cases (I am not speaking of large areas), in your opinion, the principle of Mr. Torrens' Acts of 1868 and 1879 is very advisable?—I think it might well be applied if the initiative be taken by the Metropolitan Board of Works, instead of being left, as it is by Mr. Torrens' Acts, to the vestries, who are locally interested in matters of this sort, who will not act, and do not act; I would give it to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and let them put it into operation.

225. Then you think they would put it much more into operation than the vestries have done?—They would put it in operation quickly, if it were their duty to it; as they do all their work very well, they would do that very well, I think; that is my opinion.

226. It has been alleged that the arbitrators have been too liberal in their compensation. What do you say about that?—That is a matter of opinion. I think the result of that jury list, which I have never seen until this very morning, will give you a better idea as to whether I have been too liberal. So far as my arbitrations are concerned, I hear both sides, and I draw the line between the evidence of A. B. on one side and C. D. on the other, and exercise my long experience in these matters in the best way I can. Of course I quite feel that I am a very fallible man, and that I may make great mistakes, as all men do; but I have given a great deal of attention to these questions, and really, looking through my valuations, my figures, in many cases, do not very materially vary from those of the gentleman who is the principal witness for the Board in these cases, Mr. Vigers.

227. The allegation has rather taken this line in the evidence before us. People who have been holding this kind of very bad property have left it in a bad state of repair, let it at exorbitant rents, and then made use of their own wrong in order to get large compensation from the arbitrator?—I should judge of that when the claim was put before me in this way: I should ask myself, What is the true letable value of this house in this condition? and rule accordingly; if the house was in a dilapidated condition, and I thought that it would be a waste of money to repair it, I should calculate the value of it upon the principle of what is the land worth and the materials, and let the claimant have that, and no more. In many cases I have done that. I had a case at Whitechapel belonging to a gentleman of considerable importance and eminence in the City. The Board in that scheme took a large quantity of houses; I forget how many. They covered a considerable area, 50,000 feet, I should think. The houses seemed to me past repair, indeed to repair them would be like putting new wine into old bottles, and therefore a waste of money. I calculated it all as ground, and I gave by my provisional award 25,000*l.* He claimed 43,000*l.* The claimant appealed. I confirmed my award; and he did not go to a jury. That is one case in which I exercised my judgment upon the view that these houses are no longer fit for this purpose, therefore pull them down and let the land. In looking at that I found that I had given him 10*s.* a foot superficial, which, as you have heard, is at the rate of 6*d.* per foot and 20 years' purchase. It is a fact that the whole of the compensations in the Whitechapel scheme, the land and buildings together, came to about 10*s.* a foot; there were about six acres there, and the final award was 130,000*l.*, which is about 10*s.* a foot; I do not know whether it is worth that for workmen's dwellings, but I believe commercially it would have been judicious for any owner of that property, as a whole, to pull it all down, and let it out for commercial purposes; I think he would have got more than 10*s.* a foot for it. That is an instance which occurs to me as showing that some of these cases, if they were dealt with commercially, might be so dealt with with advantage, instead of causing, as at present, a great loss to the ratepayer. I cannot give you a comparison in the other schemes, because in many cases claims were settled by the Metropolitan Board of Works without coming to me at all; consequently I have no means of knowing the aggregate cost, but the officers of the Metropolitan Board of Works could, if it were necessary or desirable, give you that information.

228. Then you did take into consideration, under the Act of 1875, the then condition of the property?—Certainly.

229. Have you read the Act of 1879?—I have read the Act of 1879.

230. You have not yet acted under that Act, I believe?—No, I have not. I think the later schemes I had in 1880 were brought under Acts of Parliament that were passed before the Act of 1879 was passed, but I have read the third section of the amended Act.

231. Have you anything to say about that?—If I read it correctly, it seems to me that in the Little Coram-street scheme, which I have got in hand, I shall have to put that clause in operation, and I shall hear, no doubt, from counsel on one side and the other what the true interpretation of it is. Therefore I had better withhold my

Chairman—continued.

my opinion of the interpretation of that clause until I have acted upon it judicially.

232. Until you have had it argued before you?—Yes. All I can say upon that third section is that it is intelligible to me, and that I understand its scope.

233. I believe you want to say something about the weekly tenants, and how you treated them? — Really some misapprehension exists about my mode of compensating the weekly tenants. I have not had time, nor was it light reading, to go through the Blue Book, but my attention has been called to one remark which was made by Mr. Richardson, in answer to a question put to him, Q. 5741. Mr. Richardson said, or led the Committee to believe, so far as I read his answer, that I had given 15 *l.* to every house. The first scheme that I tried, so to speak, was at Liverpool. I found that many of the weekly tenants there had been in occupation 30, 40, and, I believe, 50 years, and it seemed to me a very hard thing to turn these poor creatures out into the world for no fault of their own without giving them some compensation, Mr. Raynor, the town clerk, who conducted the case on the part of the corporation, was good enough to speak to the corporation upon the subject, and they authorised him to say that they should not object if I thought fit to give 1 *l.* a year for every year a tenant had been in occupation, not exceeding, however, in any case 15 *l.* I adopted that plan, and I have adopted it in every subsequent scheme. I do not know whether it is legal or not. I thought it fair and proper to give that compensation, leaving it to the local authorities either to dispute their liability and not pay the money, or to pay it. I think in some of my country schemes the local authorities have not paid the money; I think they have turned the tenants out; I am not sure; but that is my impression. I found that the demand for the rooms in these crowded districts was very great. I saw very few empty. The Committee may be surprised to hear, in reference to Petticoat-lane, that it came before me in evidence on sworn testimony that the demand there is so great that people have been willing to give as much as 5 *l.* or more to get a weekly tenant out in order that they might get possession of the room. That is a sort of tenant-right.

Chairman.

234. A tenant-right was established?—Yes. I have the sworn testimony of a man who says, "Here is the receipt for the money, sir." Of course I am obliged to believe him. Petticoat-lane is a very populous district, and while I am touching upon Petticoat-lane I may say it is a most remarkable thing that the surprising density of the population, and the enormous amount of trade which goes on in that vicinity, is such that I was told that I could not appreciate it at all unless I went down there on a Sunday; that is their busiest day; accordingly, I went on a Sunday, and it was like a fair. Then as regards this compensation to weekly tenants, I may tell the Committee that I have in my time

Chairman—continued.

bought very large areas of property for railway companies, and have invariably compensated the weekly tenants. The land for the new station of the Great Eastern Company at Liverpool-street was bought by my firm, and we paid in money taken round in a bag to those weekly tenants as much as 7,500 *l.*; and Mr. Pownall, the surveyor close by here, who was employed by the Government to buy the site for the Courts of Justice, in like manner had money supplied to him by the Government; he compensated the weekly tenants in ready money, and took the key and let them go out. He spent 3,250 *l.* in paying weekly tenants. I have ascertained from him that there were 834 of them. Some had small sums and others had large sums; but you see that averages 4 *l.* a piece.

235. Taking the first of these schemes, amounting to 122,000 *l.*, what would be the per-centage?—I cannot tell you.

236. Would it be 1 per cent.?—I could not tell you; I have no conception.

237. You have no means of saying?—No, I have not; but the Metropolitan Board of Works could tell you, because they paid the money. Then there was something said about my taxation of the costs.

238. I should like to know what you have to say about the taxation of costs?—With regard to that, the most onerous and disagreeable duty I have had to perform, the course I pursued was this: the claimants send their bills of costs to the Metropolitan Board of Works or to the local authority, and if the Board objects, then it comes to me according to the Act of Parliament. I have a meeting of the claimant's solicitor, and one of the solicitors from the Board of Works, and I have the assistance of my own private solicitor sitting by my elbow, and the question of costs is discussed as to what should be allowed and what should not be allowed. Both sides are heard upon the subject; I decide, then and there, in the presence of the parties, whether counsel should be allowed or not, and, if allowed, how much. I did not disguise my views from them, so that they might know what my decision would be in other cases. I said to them, "It is no use your bringing counsel in a small case of this kind, because I shall not allow his fees; it is no use your bringing a Queen's Counsel to me in a case of this kind, when a junior, at a cost of five, six, or seven guineas would be sufficient." As regards the surveyors, I then and there decide the question as it relates to their fees. The scale is well known by everybody, and that, as a rule, I allow the fees of one surveyor only. If the amount of the award is a couple of thousand pounds, or so, and I think the man was justified in having more professional aid, I probably allow him a fee and a half.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

239-40. Do you take Ryde's scale?—Yes, I take Ryde's scale. Ryde's scale is a liberal scale, but in my taxation I make it to cover a great many things, that is to say, plans and all that kind of thing; I do not allow anything for plans. I am informed by my solicitor that the Taxing Mas-

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

ters of the Court of Chancery or of the Court of Queen's Bench have recognised Ryde's scale; and I can give you a case which he has given to me in which they have done so. The scale has been approved of and adopted by the Court of Chancery in a case under the Lands Clauses Act, of The Attorney General *v.* The Drapers' Company (9 Equity Cases, 69); I mean to say, it is not the recognition by a lay arbitrator like myself, but a recognition by the Court of Chancery. Of course it must be used sparingly, and according to the merits of the case. I should like the Committee to have the solicitor from the Board of Works here, and let him say whether I have exceeded a proper allowance for costs; and my solicitor, who has read Mr. Rodwell's evidence (because it affects him), writes me a letter upon the same subject, though I do not know that I need trouble the Committee with it. Mr. Rodwell says that his system, if he had began it, would have differed from mine, mainly in that he would have allowed no costs of appeal from the provisional award if he thought such an appeal groundless. I have done the same thing as a matter of fact, and would have disallowed the whole costs of any appeal which seemed to me to be frivolous, and I have disallowed costs wholesale, as the solicitor of the Board of Works will be able to testify; but the question is, what is a groundless appeal? My solicitor, Mr. Winckworth, if the Committee please, can come and state exactly the principle upon which he advised me upon this question of costs, unless the Committee would permit me to read what he has written to me.

241. Will you read the letter?—"It appears that Mr. Rodwell's system would have differed from yours mainly in that he would have allowed no costs of an appeal from the provisional award, if he thought such appeal groundless. I think you would have done the same (as you in many cases did), and would have disallowed the whole costs of any appeal which seemed to you frivolous; and therefore the real question is, what is the meaning of the term, 'a groundless appeal.' The Act provides that in any case where the authority has made a definite offer in due time the arbitrator shall have no power to give any costs. I can only understand this to mean that in all cases (except those where the arbitrator, in his discretion, thinks no costs ought to have been incurred)" (which I have thought in many cases) "he is to allow claimants a proper sum for costs; and I consider that when persons have their property compulsorily taken from them, it cannot be intended that they should be bound to accept the sum awarded to them in the provisional award (probably much less than the amount their professional advisers have assured them they are entitled to), without their professional advisers having an opportunity of pointing out to the arbitrator the grounds on which they think the claim of their client can be substantiated" (that is to say, these men are justified in getting professional evidence to support their claim). "In the smaller cases, if a claimant can only appear before you at the risk of having to pay his own costs; if he fails to induce you to increase your award, he would often be unable to appear at all, as the expense in case of failure might amount to a serious per-centage on the amount awarded; I, therefore, advise you that, in my opinion, you ought to allow reasonable costs to everyone who came before you with a *bonâ fide* belief that he would be enabled to point out a valid reason why the amount given him by your provisional award should be increased in his favour." (That is the rule on which I have gone through all these 600 cases.) "Another point on which Mr. Rodwell appears to differ from you is as to allowing the expense of preparing a claim. If, by the answer to Question 4878, Mr. Rodwell means that he has in every instance added a sum to cover this expense to the amount he has calculated as the value of the property, there is no difference between your systems, except that you distinguish more accurately between the value of the land and the cost of obtaining it. But if this is not the case, I can only say, in my opinion, the expenses of preparing the claim are a portion of the costs of the arbitration; and in support of my view I may cite the authority of the Taxing Masters of the Queen's Bench Division, who invariably allow such items on the taxation of costs under the Lands Clauses Act. As the Act requires a claim to be properly sent in, they are certainly costs properly incurred" (and I may say this, that the advisers, the solicitors to the Metropolitan Board of Works, have never yet, to my knowledge, disputed that point, that the claimant is entitled to that expenditure of making out the claim; it is partly consequent upon the arbitration); "as the Act requires a claim to be sent in, they are certainly costs properly incurred, and since very few claimants would be able to value their own property in such a way as to prepare a claim which would be of any use to the arbitrator, they are obliged to call in professional aid to do it for them. As an accurate and well-drawn claim often enables the arbitrator to make such an award as is acceptable to both sides, and so to save all further expense, it seems to me to be the most economical course to pay a proper sum to a competent person for preparing this document in each case, and so (in the majority of cases) to insure that each claim shall be an intelligible and correct statement of the facts on which the award is to be based." Then the rest of the letter refers to Ryde's scale, and I have already dealt with that.

242. We have it in evidence before us, that in some of the places there have been men going about as what are called "touters," for the purpose of getting people to state their claim; is that so?—I knocked one man's bill for 350 *l.* entirely out, and did not allow him anything. I said, "You have been touting for this; you have been making business; I am very sorry, but I shall not allow you a shilling."

243. Have you found that to occur often?—No, not very often, because after the first taxation they found that I would not allow it.

244. They found that it did not answer?—They found that it did not answer.

245. Do you know anything at all about the transactions between the Metropolitan Board of Works

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

Works and the Peabody Trustees?—I do not; I only know what I have seen in the newspapers.

246. Can you give us any information as to the cost at which artizans' buildings could be put up?—No; I have no experience as to that. It depends so much upon what land you are going to get, the locality, the shape of the ground, and a variety of incidents and circumstances about which, without a particular scheme before me, I could give no opinion.

247. In your opinion would it be wise to put up some buildings with inferior accommodation to those which at present exist, and which have been put up by the Peabody Trustees and other companies?—Instead of these lands being put up for tender, with very restrictive conditions as I understand (I have not read them; I was never consulted as to whether they were restrictive or not, and I never read anything that I am not obliged to read), I should have recommended the Government or the Home Secretary, if I had been asked, to authorise the Metropolitan Board of Works to put up a block of buildings themselves, and to build them in such a way as would satisfy the Home Secretary, with restrictions as to underletting, and all that sort of thing. Then they would have had experience of the class of tenants which they were going to provide for, and which they are bound under the Streets Acts to provide for; and whether they are to provide for people who are not turned out of the particular localities with which we have been dealing, but who come from somewhere else. I should have then said, "You have got a very good basis or criterion to go upon; I do not want you to be a building society, but you have had experience, and therefore you will be able to let your land, knowing exactly what restrictions should be imposed, and what capabilities the land affords, and what you can get by it." However, that was not done. I know nothing at all about the value of land for those purposes except this. I am a shareholder and a member of the executive council of the Victoria Dwellings Association, which was constituted about five or six years ago, and is supported by a great many persons of influence. Mr. Walter, the Member for Berkshire, is the chairman, and the Right honourable Chairman of this Committee laid the first stone. We have buildings at Battersea and at King's Cross. I applied to the manager and secretary, General Scott, to give me some information with reference to the ground rent that we pay, the rents that we receive, and the class of persons who inhabit the rooms, and I have from him a statement, if you would like me to give it to you, or you would get more information, if I may say so, from General Scott himself than by my giving it you second hand.

248. Probably you will be able to give us quite enough if you give us the statement?—We are a limited company, and of course our services are all voluntary; we get nothing for being upon the executive council. We have had two dividends during the period of our existence. One was a dividend of 4½ per cent., paid on the 30th of June 1880, and we had a 3 per cent. dividend last year. We have two establishments, one at

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

Battersea and one at King's Cross. At Battersea we bought the land of the Government at 1,600 *l.* an acre, which was a very moderate price. We have not built on the whole of it; we have only built on a part. It seems that there are three blocks, one block of artizans' dwellings, and two blocks of labourers' dwellings. The artizans' block contains 98 tenements of three and four rooms each, in all 304 rooms. The labourers' block contains 90 tenements of one and two rooms each, in all 156 rooms. The rentals range from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 9 *s.* per week, the average weekly rental being 2 *s.* 4¾ *d.* per room.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

249. That is the average, taking both blocks together?—Yes.

Chairman.

250. Some of the Committee want you to say what you mean by "artizans" and what by "labourers?"—I really cannot tell you, I am sorry to say; I think it means what the words indicate, namely, that part of these are skilled artizans and the others are labourers.

Mr. *Cropper.*

251. The artizans are men getting a better income?—Yes. General Scott says that the labourers' tenements have one and two rooms. At the present time 180 tenements are occupied and eight tenements are empty. The number of persons occupying these buildings at the present time may be estimated at between 800 and 900 persons, consisting of artizans and labourers of all kinds, railway servants, commissionaires, coachmen, &c.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

252. By the Paper that was handed in last year of the statement of agencies at work in connection with artizans' dwellings, the Victoria Dwellings Association was stated to have 421 families in their dwellings?—Yes.

253. You have told us that there were only 460 rooms in those dwellings?—I do not know personally; I am only reading from General Scott's statement, and this is only as to Battersea. Then in Stroud Vale (that is the one at King's-cross), "Area under lease to the association, 77,749 feet, at a yearly rental of 437 *l.*, equivalent to 1⅓ *d.* per superficial foot." It is a thickly populated district. "The buildings consist of three blocks of labourers' dwellings, containing 478 tenements of one, two, or three rooms each; in all 821 rooms. The rentals range from 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 8 *s.* 6 *d.* per week, the average weekly rental being 2 *s.* 11¾ *d.* per room. At the present time 380 tenements are occupied, and 98 tenements are empty. The number of persons occupying these buildings at the present time may be estimated at 1,900, consisting of railway servants, cabmen, carmen, artizans, and labourers of all kinds, &c."

Mr. *Torrens.*

254. What is your date; what do you call "the present time?"—To-day. Now if it will interest the Committee I will read the occupations of the tenants.

255. We

Chairman.

255. We have had this part of it, I think, before from the secretary. We have a Paper upon it, and it will be sufficient if you will kindly hand that document in. I hand in a list of occupations of tenants; that is all I think I need say about that. (*The same was handed in.*)

256. In your opinion do labourers need this sort of barrack buildings more than the skilled artizans?—For many years I have been engaged in matters of this sort, and as long ago as 1870, when I gave evidence before Mr. Goschen's Local Taxation Committee, I ventured to enunciate a principle which appeared to me to be inevitable, namely, that those working men who got 16 *s.*, 17 *s.*, 18 *s.*, or 21 *s.* a week, should live in a barrack, so to speak, with a common wash-house and a common kitchen; and in these compensation cases I have had to deal with registered lodging-houses where very poor people itinerants, here to-day and gone to-morrow, sleep. They get a bed for 3 *d.* or 4 *d.* a night and the use of the kitchen to boil their coffee, and so on. Now it seems to me, as one of the public, that if the local authority had the power to erect buildings of that class in various parts of the metropolis, they might provide for poor people, such as cabmen, watermen at the stands, charwomen, men at the docks who are employed to-day and who are not employed again for two or three days perhaps, getting very scanty wages at the best and others. In reading through Mr. Torrens' Amended Act of 1879, it seemed to me that he must have had a scheme of that kind in his mind, because if you read the 19th and 20th clauses of that Amended Act there is a provision there made for enabling the local authority, when they have taken property which is unfit for human habitation or in such a state as to render it a nuisance, to let the land or build houses (as I read the Act) upon that land and let them; and they have power under this Act of Mr. Torrens' to make bye-laws for the proper regulation of the place and its inmates.

257. Would you give the same power to the Metropolitan Board of Works?—I would give the same power to the Metropolitan Board of Works, not limited, as Mr. Torrens' Act is, to any property that they may have acquired in isolated cases; but I would give that power upon any lands which they may acquire under these Acts of 1875 and 1879, or any other Act, or by any other means by which they legally acquire land, to spend money in buildings, and to make bye-laws, subject, of course, to approval by the confirming authority. I would give them power to do this, and I cannot help thinking, from my experience and knowledge of these poor people, that that would be the most beneficial thing to do.

258. Do you think that they could be built so as to pay?—I cannot say; that depends again upon what you are going to pay for the ground. I think it might be made to pay, but of course I am not prepared to give an opinion upon that without getting some drawings out, finding a site, estimating how many beds the building will hold, and so on; and I must say that the registered lodging-houses (and I went into several in regard to these schemes) appeared to me to be well regulated; in fact, they are under rules and regulations, as you know; I saw some of the people there, and they were very orderly, and the places seemed clean.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Torrens.*

259. Do I correctly understand your suggestion to be that, *plus* the power which is taken under my Amended Act, you would give like powers to the Board of Works?—Yes.

260. To meet the expense out of their funds?—Yes, out of the ratepayers money.

261. No, out of the metropolitan funds?—Yes.

262. You would give the alternative power to them to do it, if they would?—Yes.

263. May I ask you, have you any reason at all to hope that they would do it; I mean, have you any reason to suppose that that is the tendency of the administration of the Board of Works?—I am quite unable to give an opinion upon that, because I do not know the mind of the members.

264. I do not mean as to the members individually, but as to their general policy?—If I were a member of the Metropolitan Board of Works I should be able to answer your question directly, and I should say I should promote it to the best of my power.

Chairman.

265. Have you anything you wish to add to your evidence upon the Acts?—No, I do not think there is anything more.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

266. I suppose you have read the motion which was opposed in the House of Commons appointing this Committee?—I do not know that I have.

267. The first words are, "With a view of considering how the expense of, and the delay and difficulty in, carrying out these Acts may be reduced"?—Yes.

268. You have been good enough to give us some interesting and valuable information, both as to costs and compensation in acquiring the land. You have had some considerable experience, have you not, in the method under which the land has been sold, and therefore as to the money obtained for the land?—I have heard it, but I have never been consulted with reference to it.

269. There can be no doubt that the cost of carrying out the Act arises from the very large difference between the payment made for the land and the payment received for the land?—Yes.

270. Therefore, if we can reduce the cost of acquiring the land and increase the amount paid for the land, we shall decrease one of the difficulties in carrying out the Act, shall we not?—No doubt.

271. Are you aware that the only land that has been sold under the Act of 1875 has been sold to the Peabody Trustees?—I have no absolute knowledge of that; I have no means of knowing it, except from what I read in the papers.

272. We

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

272. We have it on the notes that it is so; have you read the evidence of Mr. Vigers, as to the amount realised for the land by the sales to the Peabody Trustees?—I have not read it attentively; I just skimmed through it; it did not concern me. The object of my coming before the Committee was to give my experience of the working of the Act, and to make any suggestions which I thought might improve the working of the Act and reduce the cost of it.

273. Then I must read to you a few of the answers given by Mr. Vigers, and ask you whether you agree with them, remembering that you have had very great experience, perhaps as great as any man, in determining the value of sites of this kind?—I have certainly had a great deal of experience in determining the value of sites of all classes of property.

274. At page 160, Question 4413, addressed to Mr. Vigers, runs thus: "Having regard to the obligations imposed upon the land which was taken by the Peabody Trustees, do you think the Peabody Trustees have paid the full market value? (*A.*) I think that with regard to some of the sites to be dealt with for trade purposes, the full market value would be a great deal more than we paid for it." May I ask whether you agree with Mr. Vigers in that answer?—As to some of the land, unquestionably the commercial value of the land is, of course, greater than the sum paid.

275. Then I call your attention to the fact that it is the land sold to the Peabody Trustees for the erection of dwellings?—Yes.

276. Because Mr. Vigers says that the full market value would be a great deal more than we paid for it?—What I understand by that answer of Mr. Vigers' is this: Mr. Vigers means, I think, the full market value in its unrestricted sense.

Chairman.

277. Will you read the next question?—"That is not the question; having regard to the obligations imposed upon the land by the Statute of 1875, upon any one buying or leasing it, do you think that the Peabody Trustees, taking one site with another, have paid the fair market value all through? (*A.*) I think it is a moderate price. I think it might have stood a little more. In fact, I did make a very careful consideration of it, and I thought the outside price for dealing with it was 4*d.* per foot."

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

278. May I ask whether you agree with that answer?—If the land referred to in that question and the price referred to relate to land for the erection of workmen's dwellings, or artizans' houses, or Waterlow's Buildings, I should say that 4*d.* per foot was as much as the promoters of any company like Waterlow's Company could afford to pay.

279. Then you practically agree with Mr. Vigers when he says, "I thought the outside price for dealing with it was 4*d.* per foot"?—For that purpose; and I am fortified in that by a transaction which took place between the Metropolitan Board of Works and an owner of property

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

upon which I advised, and which was situate in Southwark (you have had it in evidence here; Mr. Richardson mentioned it) the Pickled Herring Wharf land. That belonged to a client of mine, and I advised him not to sell it under 20,000*l.* I thought it well adapted for buildings such as we are now speaking of, and I remember offering the land to Waterlow's Company at 20,000*l.*, but I had a letter from them saying that they could not afford to give so much for it. I kept it in hand for some time, and then it was bought by the Metropolitan Board of Works, as was stated in evidence the other day, at 4*d.* a foot.

280. You are probably aware that that has been sold to a company, who are about to commence work upon it?—No; I thought it was sold to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

281. I rather want to keep to the lines laid down by the Chairman, that our questions should refer to the sites under the Act of 1875. Let me ask you as to Question 4438, in which Mr. Vigers deals with the sites as a whole. "Then, taking all the sites all over, do you think they were worth more than 3*d.* a foot? (*A.*) I have never made an average of them. I thought, and I think now, that, taking those other five sites, if they had been free to deal with this site, and charge the largest rent without any restriction, it is worth more than 4*d.* a foot. You may take an average of 5*d.* If I might take the sites and charge as big a rent as I liked, I think I could give them 5*d.* for them"?—I have no experience as to that.

282. Having regard to the statement which you made previously, that your figures as to the valuation of properties of this kind rarely materially varied from those of Mr. Vigers, may I ask you whether you agree with him in that answer?—My answer that you have now quoted relates to the compensation cases.

283. It relates to the value of the land, the amount to be paid to the persons who own it?—Quite so: but it does not relate to the value of the land to sell, after it has been cleared.

284. From what you know of Mr. Vigers' experience, do you think his estimate is one upon which the Committee might rely?—Mr. Vigers has had a great deal of experience, as much as anybody; and I should certainly rely upon Mr. Vigers' estimate, unless I can look at every individual case myself, and form my own opinion.

285. Then as you cannot do that, may I take it that your opinion of Mr. Vigers' experience is of such a character as to induce you to regard his opinion as one upon which the Committee can rely?—Yes.

286. Question 4449 is, "Then the Peabody Trustees have, in your opinion, obtained these six sites at 50 per cent. less than their fair market price, or the price which might have been given by societies, even those restricted to five per cent? (*A.*) They might have got that price, I think." You think, then, that Mr. Vigers is probably a reliable authority when he gives that opinion?—I am not sure; I cannot form any opinion about it. I do not know what was in Mr. Vigers' mind. Inasmuch as I have shown you,

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

so far as I know, we cannot make it pay at Stroud Vale at 1¼ *d.* per foot, I do not know how anybody building workmen's dwellings can afford to give more than 4 *d.* per foot.

287. Probably you are aware that persons have given 6 *d.* a foot, and are making it pay?—I am not aware of that.

288. Then I would call your attention to some buildings privately erected on the eastern side of Shoreditch?—All I can say upon that, is this, that the honourable Baronet has often told me that they could not afford to pay more than 4½ *d.* per foot.

Chairman.

289. Of course a good deal depends upon the rents you charge the inhabitants?—Of course it would. I do not profess, and do not come here to give any evidence upon such a subject; I will give you all the information I do possess; but I cannot say whether 5 *d.* is a proper price, or whether 4 *d.* is a proper price.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

290. You were good enough to tell us that your evidence upon the value of land coincided with that of Mr. Vigers as regards the purchase of land, and therefore I wanted to learn how far your ideas of value were likely to coincide with his when we come to the sale of land?—Yes.

291. You agree with me, I presume, that it is as important to get the full market price when you sell, as it is not to pay more than the full market price when you buy?—Quite so, unless you restrict a man to a class of buildings which will not admit of his getting a fair interest for his money.

292. Now we will come to the second part of the sale; are you aware that the Peabody Trustees are entitled to buy their ground rents at 20 years' purchase?—I am.

293. You have had great experience, have you not, in valuing ground rents?—Yes.

294. May I ask you whether it is not a fact that ground rents are of larger or smaller value as the head rent bears a proportion to the rack rent?—Quite so.

295. As the rent of the land bears to the rack rent?—Quite so.

296. In the case of ground rents of workmen's dwellings, the rent of land is very small as compared with the value of the property built upon it, is it not?—Quite so.

297. Then do you think that 20 years' purchase was a fair market value for a ground rent which was so small compared with the value of the property?—No.

298. When I tell you that ground rents of improved dwellings have been sold at 27 years' purchase, would you think that an excessive price?—I should think it high.

299. Although the ground rent was so very small compared to the rack rent?—It depends upon what you call very small; what proportion did the ground rent bear to the net rack rent of the property?

300. The ground rent was probably one-thirtieth part of the rack rent?—Then it would, no doubt, be worth 27 years' purchase.

301. Then if the ground rents of the sites already sold have been sold at 20 years' purchase, instead of 27 years' purchase, the ratepayers have lost a very large sum of money?—That follows.

302. Then you suggested to the Committee just now that the Metropolitan Board should have authority to erect dwellings themselves, in order that they might have personal experience?—Yes.

303. Do you think it is better for them to gain that personal experience than to derive that experience from the results of the workings of the various societies who put up these dwellings?—They are under special directions by the Act of Parliament to erect dwellings for the working classes, to be approved by the confirming authority.

304. Who are "under special directions"?—The Metropolitan Board are bound to let the land for that purpose.

305. Not to erect the buildings?—No, I made a mistake as to that; I should have said to let the land for that purpose. What I meant by the experiment of building was that they should build themselves, in order that they might know how far they could impose restrictions upon any other lands which they had to let for a similar purpose.

306. Do you not think that they gather that experience from the large number of companies already building on lands which they have let?—They might do so, but I should prefer the other.

307. Would you really prefer that a public body should try an experiment of trading in and building small tenements rather than that persons who have had experience in it should risk their own money?—It depends on whether the persons so building upon their own speculation are building the same class of buildings as those which you can impose upon any of the authorities building upon the land acquired under these Acts.

308. Has not the Metropolitan Board, as the local authority, absolute control over the class of buildings, because they are to determine the plans?—Yes, they have the control, as I am informed. I have never heard what the restrictions are; I have always heard that the restrictions imposed by the Metropolitan Board of Works in letting this land were so onerous that nobody would bid for the land.

309. Are you aware that those restrictions have been very materially relaxed since this Committee made a report?—I am not.

310. Do you know the length of the lease under which the Metropolitan Board let the site under the Act of 1875 to the Peabody Trustees?—No, I do not know it.

311. We have it in evidence that it was 80 years, with the restriction that the buildings should be kept and maintained as workmen's dwellings for that term; suppose restriction were reduced from 80 to 10 years, may I ask you from your great knowledge as an architect, and your large experience in controlling the structural parts of buildings, whether it would not be possible to construct the buildings, so that they might be occupied by working people for 10 years, and then converted either into warehouses or dwellings suitable to a very different class

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

class of persons?—"Warehouses" is one thing, "other dwellings" is another. I should not think they would be fit to be converted into warehouses.

312. Will you just look at that plan and elevation for a moment (*handing a plan to the Witness*). On the left you see the workmen's dwellings and on the right you see an alteration?—Yes.

313. Structurally, could not that alteration be made without much difficulty?—At first sight this would be a very expensive process of conversion. In the first place I see by this plan that which is to be the warehouse would involve the taking away of those walls.

314. The internal walls?—The internal walls, which now carry the construction of the floors above; all the construction of those floors would have to be altered for warehouse purposes. The external walls might be used for warehouses.

315. Now look at the elevation?—Yes, I see it.

316. If a man could obtain four or five times as much rent, would not it suit his purpose to remove the internal walls?—Of course it would if he could obtain four or five times as much rent.

317. Then, in the case of buildings for the working classes, on land which Parliament has dedicated to that purpose, the owners being restricted to only 10 years' occupation, would there not be great risk of the buildings being converted in order to obtain larger rent?—I really do not follow your question. I put it to the honourable Baronet that he is asking me a variety of professional questions, and expects me off-hand to give an opinion about them. Notwithstanding that he has been good enough to say that I have very great experience, my experience has always led me to be very cautious in giving an opinion without consideration.

318. Then, do I understand you to say that you could not offer an opinion as to whether, if buildings of this kind were restricted to only 10 years' occupation as workmen's dwellings, they might not, with advantage, in order to obtain the increased rent, be altered so as to be occupied entirely for a different purpose?—That is an abstract proposition which I can answer in this way: the original structure might be so so erected as to provide for sufficient thickness of external walls to carry the weight which might be put upon them, by a different class of use to that to which it is to be applied during the first 10 years of the term; and as to whether it might be altered with advantage, depends upon what increased rental you would derive from the warehouse when altered from the dwellings for which it was first erected, taking, of course, into account the cost of the alteration. That is the way I should arrive at it; if I had to advise any person upon such a subject, that is the way in which I should go about it.

319. Then, if sufficient increased rent could be obtained, the building might be designed in the first instance in a form from which it might be altered with facility?—Clearly.

320. The Committee have been told that land which is let at 3*d.* a foot would, if unrestricted, be worth 2*s.* a foot?—Very likely.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

321. That is a very large increase?—Yes.

322. Is not that kind of increase sufficient to justify such a structural alteration as that suggested?—I should think it would be.

323. Then, if any number of buildings were so altered to that extent, the intention of Parliament, in setting aside this land for workmen's dwellings, would be frustrated at the end of 10 years, would it not?—Yes.

324. And all the large cost which the ratepayers have been at, for the purpose of providing dwellings for the working classes in those localities, would be lost?—No doubt.

325. That is, if the buildings were so altered?—That is so, as regards the difference in value.

326. Then, instead of the term being reduced to 10 years, I ask you whether they should not be kept for at least 40 or 50 years for the purpose for which Parliament intended them?—That is a question I cannot answer: that is a question of policy, a question of propriety, and a question of what the intention of the Legislature was.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

327. I think I understood you to say that the cost of working out the Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875 was considerable, and that it is too great?—Yes.

328. And as an alteration you advise adding a copy of the Post Office Act?—Yes; I take the scheme or idea from that.

329. If houses under these Acts were found in an unsanitary state, do you think that the owner ought to be paid more than the value of the land with the materials upon it?—That depends upon whether the unsanitariness of it can be remedied at an outlay. If it could be remedied, then it would go in diminution of the value of the good house that might be built for people to live in.

330. Under the Act some properties are marked blue and some red; you say the red is all bad. If it is so unsanitary that everybody's pretensions as to the value of the property are utterly bad, would you value that, or think it ought to be valued, at more than the value of the land and the materials upon it?—That is a very wide question. All the land which is included in the scheme, except the blue which you have spoken of, is unsanitary, but it is unsanitary from various causes, unsanitary because the houses are packed so closely together and the streets are very narrow; but the owners having by law been allowed to hold such property without any interference, except from the sanitary officer, who has applied himself to the whitewashing and the drainage and the water, it would not be right to say that because at some previous time before the Building Act of 1855 was passed, these houses had been erected with very narrow courts and passages, therefore they are unsanitary, and the owner should be paid no greater sum than the value of the ground and the materials upon it, and that does not represent to my mind what the intention of the Legislature was.

331. Do you not think that if the landlord has neglected his duty, and the place is in a thoroughly or a very bad state, he should only receive

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

the value of the land and the materials upon it?—I have said before in my evidence that if I found a house in so bad a state as to be beyond repair, or incapable of being repaired at a reasonable cost, and being put into a condition fit for habitation, I should value it as land.

332. Are you aware the power of the local authorities with regard to nuisances is very small; in fact it does not go, I believe, beyond 10*l.* or 20*l.*; do you think that it would be a good plan that the Legislature should increase their power so as to enable them to make the landlords do the sanitary work that is necessary?—So far as I am able to give any opinion upon Mr. Torrens' Act, I think that that Act gives very wide scope to the vestries or the local authorities for making a man put his house in a sanitary condition, and I think that the Amendment Act gives a still greater and more beneficial power.

333. I think your compensation to weekly tenants was a great deal higher than Mr. Rodwell's, was it not?—According to Mr. Rodwell's evidence, certainly, I should think it was.

334. I do not know whether it is fair to ask you to answer my next question, and if it is not I will not of course press it; under the amended Act of 1879, do you think the same basis of compensation to weekly tenants ought to be carried on?—Certainly I do.

335. Have you not found a great many false agreements manufactured in these various places, in leases granted?—I cannot say that they were manufactured. I cannot prove it; I can only surmise it. Where I have surmised it, and have had reasonable ground for believing that they had been manufactured for the occasion, I rejected them.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

336. I suppose you do not separate the value of land and buildings in your valuation?—No.

337. But you have spoken of some cases where the houses were past repair, and where, I think, you only compensated for the land?—Quite so.

338. So that in some cases you do take both?—Yes; the case that I alluded to in my evidence at the commencement was was a case in point. The houses were unfit to be occupied, and I valued the claimant's property, therefore, as divested of these bad buildings, that is, as land.

339. You did not allow him anything for these houses?—No, not as houses, except the value of the materials.

340. Was his land such as might have been used for commercial purposes if it had been cleared by itself without other property being taken?—I think it might in that particular case.

341. Then you think for commercial purposes he would have got a larger sum?—No, he would not; I valued his land for what I thought he could get for it for any purpose in the market.

342. He got the full market value of the land?—He did.

343. Do you ever find comparatively good houses mixed up with the bad houses?—Sometimes, but it is very rare.

344. These areas have generally been wholly

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

composed of bad houses?—As a rule, certainly. I think there is one scheme where some houses of an owner were excluded from the general scheme absolutely by the confirming authority.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

345. Is it not the case that houses are sometimes condemned in consequence of their situation in narrow courts and alleys, but in many cases, in fact the majority, they are condemned on account of their own bad condition, are they not?—I have no cognizance of the fact. If I found a house condemned by a proper authority as unfit for human habitation, I should not value it as a house. I should say, "This is the proper authority for condemning this property; the Nuisance Removal Act, or some other Act, having control over it; and I shall not value it as rent." Then if I exercised my own judgment, I should exercise the best judgment I could, as I have already stated, as to whether the house I was valuing was capable of being made fit for habitation, and if so, at what cost, and I should make my award accordingly.

346. Is it the case that no scheme has ever been taken up if the only fault in the area has been the narrowness of the streets?—You see I did not make the scheme, and it was not my duty to report to the confirming authority from evidence whether it was an unhealthy area or a good or bad scheme; I go there for a simple purpose; I go, not for the purpose of seeing whether it is unhealthy or not, but to award how much compensation these people ought to have.

347. Has any such scheme ever come before you?—No.

348. You have told us that in deciding the price to be paid, you had some doubt when you were first appointed arbitrator, as to whether the trade which had been carried on in these dwellings should or should not be taken into consideration?—My advisers had a doubt.

349. And you obtained the opinion of counsel upon the subject?—I did.

350. Did you not think that the Act of 1875 upon that subject was very clear. In the 19th clause the words of the Act are these:—"The estimate of the value of such lands or interests shall be based upon the fair market value, as estimated at the time of the valuation being made of such lands." Would not "the fair market value" take those estimates into consideration?—I read it so. I say that a man has got an interest in land if he has got a house in which he is carrying on a trade.

351. And you have acted on that opinion throughout your arbitrations?—I have.

352. Have you ever had any doubts raised by local authorities in other towns besides London as to that opinion?—I have never had it that I know of more than once mentioned in London by counsel for the Board. In the country they have taken notice of it, because as I have already said in my evidence, I thought it my duty to send them a copy of that opinion. If you have anybody here from Birmingham they will tell you the result of the contention before juries

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

juries as to that very question. They have contended that a man is not entitled to any compensation for trade. I do not know what has been the result; all I know about it is that juries have been asked to assess the different sums, how much for the property, and how much for the trade, leaving the parties hereafter to contest it if they were so minded in a court of law.

353. Can you say in what town or towns that doubt has been expressed; I think you say it has only been expressed in one case?—Birmingham and Wolverhampton, I think. The other cases were very small, and the cost nothing at all.

354. As to the question which was raised with regard to the weekly tenants, Mr. Hunter Rodwell, in his evidence before us, said, speaking of you, "Sir Henry Hunt gave all these parties" (those are, the weekly tenants) "1*l.* per annum, limiting it to 15 years." If the person had been there ten years, for instance, you gave him 10*l.*, but you gave none of them over 15*l.*?—Yes, that is so.

355. Was it the fact that you gave them amounts according to the time they had been there?—No, never more than 15*l.* if they had been there 40 years.

356. But up to 15 years you would pay him by the years he had been there?—Yes.

357. Then in one case in the country you say you have reason to believe that the local authority, though you made that award, did not pay the money?—I have heard so.

358. Under the Act notice had to be given to those tenants that you had made that award?—Yes.

359. Then they would claim the amount of the award from the local authority?—Yes; that is a question for them. I have dealt with it in my own way, leaving the parties hereafter to contend as to their liability or otherwise.

360. Do you suggest that there should be any instruction to the arbitrators in a new Act of Parliament with reference to the weekly tenants?—I did not suggest any scheme, because I think the plan that I have adopted is fair and just to these poor people. If Parliament should think otherwise, and should think fit to insert a clause that weekly tenants are to have no compensation, then, of course, the arbitrator must obey the law.

361. Do you think the Act sufficiently clear as it stands?—I do not know whether the Act is sufficiently clear to justify me in giving the weekly tenants anything. I agree with Mr. Rodwell as to that. I do not believe that in point of law they are entitled to claim anything. I think that the local authority might, if it thought fit, acquire all the other interests, and give them a week's notice to go out. That is a mere question of law. Mr. Rodwell says that they have not the shadow of a claim in point of law.

Mr. *Balfour.*

362. I think you said, in answer to a question asked by Sir Sydney Waterlow, that supposing the exterior walls of the workmen's dwellings to be made sufficiently thick, it might pay at the end of 10 years to convert these dwellings into warehouses?—Yes; it is possible.

363. It might pay, you mean?—Yes.

364. I suppose that nobody who built workmen's dwellings with the view of keeping them permanently workmen's dwellings, would go to the unnecessary expense of making those walls thick enough to enable them to be turned into warehouses?—Certainly not.

365. Therefore, if the buildings are built *bonâ fide* for the purpose of workmen's dwellings, there is no chance of their being converted at the end of 10 years, or, in fact, of their being converted at all, into warehouses?—No.

366. That is, provided they are originally intended *bonâ fide* for workmen's dwellings?—Certainly.

Mr. *Torrens.*

367. I suppose there are very few classes of house property in the metropolis less uniform in price and demand than workmen's dwellings?—They vary in price according to the locality.

368. I understand your suggestions to point to the greater expansive power and adaptation to the fluctuating wants of the community by enabling more than one local authority to have an option for building as much of this kind of property as might be required, and no more?—Certainly; for the lowest orders, I mean.

369. Will you have the kindness to give the Committee a little more of a photographic notion of that district of Stroud Vale than I had the pleasure of hearing you give after I came into the room. Of course, if you have done it already, I will not ask you to repeat it. The district, I believe, may be described as being land-locked. It is bounded by the Great Northern Railway on the one side, and, although crowded, the land adjoining is, I believe, to a great extent still unoccupied, is it not?—I am sorry to say that although I have been on the council from its commencement, I have never been to Stroud Vale more than once, and that was when the Right honourable Chairman was there.

370. I understood you to say that the price was at a minimum, that is to say, it was under 3*s.* a week per room?—Yes; 2*s.* 11¾*d.*

371. Do you happen to know who occupies one room at that price?—I do not know; I cannot tell you.

372. Do you know whether it is occupied by a single individual or by a family?—I do not know; General Scott, who manages the property, will be able to tell you directly.

373. Would you be surprised if I told you that from that dense mass of buildings in which the people are housed at that price, and from those rooms which are inhabited and rented by single individuals, there come every week in the year to the guardians of the poor a crowd of persons applying for out-door relief?—I should not be surprised to hear it, because their wages are not sufficient to keep them and pay their high rent besides.

374. Do you consider the 3*s.* a week a high rent?—

Viscount *Emlyn.*

rent?—For a man earning 18 *s.* or 1 *l.* a week it is a high rent.

375. I think you told us that before the Post Office Land Act, 1881, was passed, the Post Office authorities had great trouble in getting sites?—Yes.

376. And that they could only obtain them at very exorbitant prices?—Under emergeney; if they wanted them quickly and promptly that was so.

377. Is the object of the Post Office Land Act to enable them to get sites cheaper?—Yes.

378. How does it operate?—In this way: if a man will not let you have the land at its fair price you can take him before a jury.

379. Had they no power before to take them before a jury?—No.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

380. I notice from the Paper you handed in that about 42 per cent. of your decisions were appealed against as regards the primary award?—Yes.

381. Did you notice any change in that respect towards the end of your arbitrations?—That Paper which you have before you will show you the fact, I think.

382. I mean, speaking generally, we had it in evidence from Mr. Rodwell that after he had decided the cases in a certain number of schemes he found the appeals fall off tremendously, that is, when it became known what the principle was he was acting upon?—I did not find that; for instance, Whitechapel was the first scheme; it took me 12 days to hear appeals in relation to that scheme; that will give you some notion of the relative number; the final award was 130,000 *l.*; that was in 1876; then if you go down to Whitecross-street, which was dealt with in 1879, it took me 14 days to hear appeals there, and the amount was 100,000 *l.* more; so that in that case there was a falling off; according to the experience I have had in all these cases, I do not see any visible or manifest falling off.

383. The point I rather wanted to get at was this: do you think that even under the present system, if arbitration went on for some years on the same principle, things would smooth themselves down, and that the number of cases appealed against would be less?—It is reasonable, I think, to anticipate that that would be so, but of course that depends very much upon whether it is the same arbitrator in each scheme. There have been three arbitrators under these schemes, myself, Mr. Rodwell, and Mr. Driver, who is hearing appeals at the present moment. I believe I am the only arbitrator that has been appointed by the Local Government Board for the country, but everything would depend upon claimants being aware of what a particular arbitrator would give, as to whether they would accept the decision or whether they would appeal or not. They would say, "It is no use appealing to Sir Henry Hunt; we know what he will give, and it is only wasting time"; but if you got another arbitrator, and I think it would be a very good thing to have a variety of arbitrators (I do not at all advocate the view that one man should be standing arbitrator all his life, or that his appointment should be at all continuous), the local authorities then would see better whether one man took a too liberal view and another what they might think a more correct view.

Mr. *Brodrick*—continued.

Mr. *Cropper.*

384. When you were dealing with these properties, had you many proofs of sales of those miserable houses?—I had no proofs of sales. Occasionally they were asked, "How much did you give for this;" that is a fair question; and to that they have sometimes given the answer that what they gave for it does not always represent the value of the property.

385. But it is a very good hint as to the value of property?—It depends upon what they have done with it, or they may have bought it very cheaply in the market, or they may have given a great deal too much for it. I have had cases of that kind put before me. It has been said, "Really, sir, I gave 600 *l.* for this property," and all the time it was not worth 300 *l.*

386. Very often you would find that the houses had been bought and sold in those very bad streets?—I have not found it so.

387. We had some evidence the other way, I think?—I have not found it so in my experience.

388. Have you seen much of the working of the Act which enables the local authorities to shut up houses altogether?—No, I have not had any experience whatever of that.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

389. Mr. Rodwell told us that he understood from you that in disposing of the weekly tenants, by giving them 1 *l.* a year up to 15 *l.*, you had the concurrence, if not the request, of the local authorities; is that correct?—I stated at the commencement of my evidence upon the subject of the weekly tenants that I had the concurrence of the Corporation of Liverpool.

390. And in the other cases, although you had not the direct concurrence of the local authorities, yet still you left it to them to oppose your award if they pleased?—Certainly.

391. Then I understand also that your experience leads you to think that that is a fair way of dealing with weekly tenants?—Yes.

392. Mr. Rodwell, in his answer to Question 4895, said that he disagreed with your view. He took each case by itself, and where there were little businesses, such as laundries, cobblers, &c., he would not give them more than simply a sum for removal?—Yes.

393. But that you consider is not doing justice to them?—Just so.

394. Do you think that there is any advantage in the suggestion which he threw out, that instead of taking each case separately, there should

Sir *Henry T. Holland*—continued.

should be a fixed sum given in all cases?—I do not agree with him at all in that. According to my view, a man who has been there six months ought not to have the same as a man who has been there six years.

395. His view was that that would save considerable complication and trouble; I understand you do not assent to that?—I do not agree with him.

Sir *Henry T. Holland*—continued.

396. It would not be desirable to save that complication unless you were fairly dealing with the tenants?—Certainly not.

Thursday, 9th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Hastings.
Sir Henry T. Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Leamy.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Justin M'Carthy.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Sir HENRY ARTHUR HUNT, C.B., re-called; and further Examined.

Chairman.

397. BEFORE your examination is continued, I understand you wish to explain the answer you gave on Monday last to Question No. 297, on page 22?—Yes. It will be remembered that the honourable Member for Gravesend asked me whether 20 years' purchase upon a ground rent was sufficient, and I answered, "No;" and he went on further to ask me whether 27 was not the proper number of years' purchase; I asked him then what proportion the ground rent upon his supposition bore te the rack value, and he said a thirtieth. I concurred, therefore, in his 27 years' purchase. What I desire is that that should not go forth as my opinion in regard to this or any particular transaction, because the number of years' purchase upon a ground rent must depend upon the contract between the parties, and the covenants and restrictions which that contract may contain. I know nothing of the contract between the Peabody Trustees and the Metropolitan Board of Works, and therefore I am particularly anxious that my opinion should be considered as based upon an abstract proposition and not as applicable to the particular subject matter upon which, as I gathered from the honourable Member's question, he desired to have information. Since I was here on Monday, I have ascertained the particulars as to the jury cases in the Golden Lane scheme, or the scheme under the Commissioners of Sewers of the City of London. There appear to have been only two jury cases, both of which were appeals by claimants, and if you will permit me, I will give you the particulars. The name of the claimant in one of those cases is King; the amount of the final award was 2,800 *l.*; the verdict of the jury was 2,850 *l.* The name of the claimant in the other case was French; the amount of the final award was 600 *l.*; the verdict of the jury was 645 *l.* Those are the only two cases of appeal in a very large scheme, amounting altogether to 213,000 *l.*, and involving many claims of importance.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

398. I think the Committee would be glad to have your great experience upon certain points that were raised by Mr. Rodwell; In the first place, in answer to Question 4888, Mr. Rodwell suggested that in future it would be quite as well to increase the appealable standard from 500 *l.* to 1,000 *l.*; what do you say to that?—If the Act of 1875 is to remain unaltered, I do not agree with him. I think 500 *l.*, the limit under the old Act, is quite sufficient.

399. You say, "if the Act of 1875 is to remain unaltered," are you referring to the alterations that you suggested to the Committee on your last examination?—No, but assuming that my suggestions find any favour with the Committee, there would be no necessity for fixing any sum, because the jury, according to my scheme, would have primary jurisdiction, so to speak.

400. Then in his answer to Question 4912, Mr. Rodwell suggested that it would be desirable to give the local authority power, or the arbitrator power to close habitations which were in a very bad state and unrepairable?—I should not give it to the arbitrator; I should give it to the Metropolitan Board of Works as the local authority.

401. Then you think it desirable to give it to the Metropolitan Board of Works?—I not only think it desirable, but I am under the impression that Mr. Torrens' Act would give them that power if they had the administration of it.

402. Then in any amendment of the Act of 1875 you would desire, as Mr. Rodwell does, to see part of Mr. Torrens' Act incorporated?—Certainly.

403. But you would vest the power of destroying the houses in the local authority?—Certainly; the local authorities being not the vestries but the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Chairman.

404. And the Commissioners of Sewers?—Yes, and the Commissioners of Sewers; I put them in the same category.

405. Would

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

405. Would you in a case like that allow any appeal, either to the Local Government Board or to the Home Secretary by the owner of the house?—I think I should.

406. You would do that, as I understand, because it manifestly would be a matter of great importance to him?—I think there should be an appeal to the Home Secretary, or the Local Government Board, as the case may be.

407. Turning to Question 4919, in which Mr. Rodwell suggests the abolition of the provisional award, your proposed scheme would do away with the provisional award, would it not?—Entirely.

408. But supposing that that scheme is not adopted, and that the present mode of procedure is carried on with some amendments, do you think the provisional award might safely be done away with?—I think the provisional award might be done away with even though the procedure under the Act, as it at present stands, goes on as it does now; but I would then suggest that instead of there being the provisional award, the parties should elect at once to go to a jury, or to an arbitrator.

409. That is the scheme which you suggested to the Committee on your last examination, is it not?—Yes.

410. I am rather desirous of knowing what your opinion is as to the possibility of doing away with the provisional award, and saving so much expenditure, assuming that that scheme is not adopted?—I would do away with the provisional order, and if the present mode of proceeding prescribed by the Act as to taking property, and so on, remained in effect, I should then leave the parties to go to a jury, as they would under the Lands Clauses Act, or to a standing arbitrator.

411. If you look at Questions 4920 and 4925 you will see Mr. Rodwell's plan for doing away with the provisional award would be to give every opportunity to the Metropolitan Board of Works (or the City) to settle, so far as they could, with the parties; that then each party should send in their particular offers to the arbitrator, and that then, instead of making a formal provisional award, the arbitrator should write to the parties, and say the sum that he proposes to give; and if they object to it, they must appear before him?—I do not approve of that at all. At present the Metropolitan Board of Works have the opportunity of settling, and in point of fact do settle, with claimants without coming before the arbitrator, or going before a jury. Many cases in the schemes I have had to deal with have been settled with the Metropolitan Board of Works. Failing a settlement the case comes to me.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

412. I think in all except the first scheme that has been the case, has it not?—All except the first scheme. In the first scheme they all came to me, and in the subsequent schemes the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Commissioners of Sewers (I have only had one scheme from the Commissioners of Sewers) settled many cases, and it was only those that they could not settle that came before me. It would be a very improper thing, I think, for the arbitrator to have before him in writing what has been offered and what has been refused. He must judge for himself after hearing the evidence.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

413. Do I understand you that since the first operation of these Acts a change has been adopted in the working of them, and that whereas formerly all cases came to the arbitrator at once, now the Metropolitan Board of Works and the parties see if they can settle the matters in the first instance?—That is so now.

414. That being so, I suppose you would disagree with Mr. Rodwell's suggestion in answer to Question 4919, that sealed tenders should be sent in to the arbitrator informing the arbitrator what the Metropolitan Board of Works were prepared to give for the property in question?—I do not think that that is a matter for the arbitrator at all. What I think ought to be done is that the costs ought to follow the event as they do now under the Lands Clauses Act, that if a man comes before the arbitrator and gets no more than the offer, then the arbitrator ought not to allow any costs, as in the case of an ordinary arbitration where each party has to pay his own costs.

415. Then in every case you would say the parties and the Metropolitan Board of Works ought first to be brought together in order to see if they can settle the case?—I think so.

416. Then following upon that, if the Metropolitan Board of Works make an offer which the owner of the house will not accept, they must then go to the arbitrator?—Certainly.

417. And by management of the costs you would punish the owner if he was unreasonable?—I would, as he is punished now under the Lands Clauses Act.

418. The object that Mr. Rodwell had in view in getting before him, in a sealed tender, the price that the Metropolitan Board of Works were prepared to give was this, he thought that the arbitrator would be in a better position to arrive at a conclusion than by having the trouble of ferretting out the particulars of each case?—As an arbitrator, I should not like my mind to be operated upon by anything of that sort.

419. I am not suggesting that the Committee should adopt that, but simply desiring to get information from you based upon your experience?—I so understand your question.

420. As to the power of the arbitrator to award costs, do you consider that the arbitrator has the same power of dealing with costs under this Act as he has under an ordinary order of reference?—I am hardly a judge of that, because I am not a taxing master, and I am not acquainted with the subject, except from what I hear from my solicitor as to what the rules of the taxing masters are with reference to costs.

421. But, taking the general principle of whether you may deprive the owner of costs, or award him costs against the Metropolitan Board of Works, do you consider that that is within your discretion?—That is entirely in my discretion, and I have exercised that discretion.

422. I ask your opinion because some question has been raised, as you will see by referring to

Sir *Henry T. Holland*—continued.

Question 4932, as to whether the arbitrator has power under the Act?—I have absolute power to disallow the whole of the costs if I think fit.

423. And you are not aware that any arbitrator has felt any difficulty and pursued a different practice, are you?—No, there have only been three arbitrators. I am one, Mr. Rodwell is another, and the other is now at work; that is Mr. Driver.

424. Then you are not aware what Mr. Rodwell refers to when he says, at page 186, "If I had this Act to put into operation myself at the commencement, and had not been aware that another practice had prevailed, I am much inclined to think that I should have allowed such and such a lump sum in a case," and so on?—I should have done nothing of the sort. I have a bill of costs put before me in the ordinary way, with the details of charges, so that I may know whether they are correct, or whether they are not; I could not jump at it.

425. Are you aware of any practice that the local authorities should pay the costs of both sides, to which also Mr. Rodwell refers?—I am not aware of any instance under this Act. I am the only arbitrator, except Mr. Rodwell, who has dealt with them at the present time, but in the absence of any offer on the part of the Metropolitan Board of Works before me, showing that they have offered more than I have awarded I should give the costs to the claimants and the Board would have to pay their own costs.

426. Supposing that a case came before you where you thought that the claims had been manufactured, and that either solicitors or surveyors had been making up claims, or supporting them, without any good ground, should you feel justified in refusing the costs of those solicitors or surveyors altogether, or in very largely cutting them down?—I should cut them down very largely, and I have done so. If the Committee would like to know the amount of the claims as compared with the amounts awarded, I can give them, so that it may be seen what they are, and to what extent the arbitrator has cut them down.

Chairman.

427. I think you had better give us that information?—I must preface what I am going to say by acquainting the Committee with the facts, that the sums I am going to represent to them as the claims do not in point of fact include all the claims, because many persons did not send any claims at all, and I had to gather up from the claims that were sent in what interests lessees and other persons had in the property, so that I had to make out their claim for them from the information given to me upon the claim by the freeholder; therefore these figures will only represent the absolute claims sent in, and my figures are given relatively, that is to say, given in respect of those claims only, and do not represent, therefore, the amount of my final award. With that explanation I will give the figures in round numbers. In the Whitechapel scheme the amount of claims received was 153,000 *l.*, and the amount awarded 92,000 *l.*; that is to say, the amount awarded in respect of the claims absolutely received was as 153,000 *l.* is to 92,000 *l.*

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

428. That is the one you dealt with yourself entirely, is it not?—Yes; but still in that case, as in others, a great many people did not send in any claims; therefore that does not represent the total amount of claims that I had to deal with, it only represents the total claims that I received.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

429. We are now upon the question of costs rather than the mere statement of what you awarded upon claims?—I only wanted to show you that the claims were very much in excess of what I gave; and of course I only gave the reasonable costs that a man ought to have been put to in making out the claim which I thought to be the proper sum, and which sum I awarded.

430. That paper which you have before you, as I suppose from what you have said, does not show how far you cut down costs?—No; but I believe I said in my examination in chief that my assessor, Mr. Winckworth, informed me that I cut down about a third upon the average. The total amount of costs added together, and the amount of the reductions, would be as two to one.

431. Does that include the cost of sending in and preparing the claim as well as the cost of the actual proceedings before you?—Yes.

432. I think I understand you to say that you do not agree with the view which Mr. Rowell expressed in answer to Question 4878, viz., that he considered that he had nothing to do with any expenses until the case came before him as arbitrator, and therefore costs for "consulting you upon claim," and "consulting So-and-so in preparing claims" he did not allow?—I venture respectfully to say that I disagree with him.

433. You consider all that a part of the proceedings for which, if the owner has proved his case, he ought to be allowed his costs?—Certainly.

434. And you consider it to be only your duty to see that those costs have not been exaggerated?—Certainly.

435. In this report do the figures under the column, "Amount of bill for arbitration costs," include costs for preparing claims such as Mr. Rodwell refers to in answer to Question 4878?—The amount of the bill for arbitration costs included a great deal more than that.

436. Of course it included the cost of the proceedings before you?—And before the claim was sent in.

437. Those costs to which I refer are the costs for preparing the claim?—Yes; but there are a great many costs incurred by these claimants before their claim is sent in.

438. How are such costs incurred except in consulting a solicitor or surveyor before the claim is made out?—Costs manufactured so as to make business; and I have drawn the line at the point of preparing the claim, that is to say, A. B. is the claimant; he is the freeholder who has let the property on lease for 14 years at 50 *l.* a year, and he claims perhaps 1,000 *l.* Mr. Winckworth's letter, from which I read an extract last time, rather explains the mode of proceeding. That states fully how he has dealt with the costs, and I may say that the bills of costs very often contain

Sir *Henry T. Holland*—continued.

contain some conveyancing charges with which I have nothing to do. I strike those out, and in order to guard against doing any injustice to the claimant I make a note at the bottom of my certificate that I have struck out those charges as regards conveyancing, because they do not come into my review.

439. Is there any appeal from your decision as to costs to a Taxing Master?—No. I keep the bills and do not give any details. I merely give a certificate for the amount due. I never give any details, and never give the bills back again. I should never have a moment's peace if I did.

440. No doubt you are quite right not to give the reasons. You told us you applied Ryde's scale in all cases of surveyors' claims?—Yes; I allow them where I think a surveyor is absolutely necessary. Sometimes I have cases where surveyors' services are not required.

441. And where, therefore, no scale should be applied?—No.

442. Ryde's scale, speaking generally, allows a per-centage upon the sum given in the award, does it not?—Yes; a graduated scale.

443. You do not agree, as I understand, with Mr. Rodwell, when he says, in answer to Question 5053, "It is a very good scale in purchasing property where you are not dealing with the claims of parties, but if I had allowed it it would have made thousands of pounds difference." In your opinion, if Ryde's scale is properly worked, that would be an incorrect statement?—I think so, according to my experience.

444. And your experience is, perhaps, the greatest of anybody's?—Yes, I think so. The objection which I made to the costs was as to the number of surveyors that were employed, who expected to be paid upon that scale, and I exercised a discretion, as I explained in my examination in chief, allowing only the charges for one surveyor. When I did that I did not know who the surveyor was. I did not say, "I will allow A. B.'s charges," but "I will allow such and such a sum upon Ryde's scale," that amount representing surveyors' evidence. The parties may divide that how they like; and, as I have stated to the Committee, I have always told them when they were before me what I should allow for the surveyors, and how much I should allow for counsel.

445. But wherever you allowed a surveyor, you allowed his costs upon Ryde's scale, as I understand?—Yes, almost always.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

446. Have you in any case awarded costs against the claimant on the ground that the claim has been excessive?—No.

447. Have you power to do that?—I think I have, but I am not sure.

448. On the ground that the claimant has refused a reasonable offer?—No, never; I could not do so on that ground, because I have never known any offer that has been made to him.

449. But I understand you to advise that in future the arbitrator should have that power?—The arbitrator should have the power if it should turn out in the end that his award is less than the sum offered by the local authority. Then I think he ought not to have his costs.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

450. You think that they should follow as a matter of course?—I do.

451. That the costs should go against the claimant, even the costs of the local authority?—Yes, that the costs should abide the event as under the Land Clauses Act.

452. You have that power already, I understand?—I believe I have.

453. But you have not exercised it?—No, I have not exercised it.

454. I understand your proposal is that at a very early stage the parties should have the power of electing whether they will go to the jury or to the arbitrator?—Yes, after a standing arbitrator has been named.

455. Would that be likely to limit the expenditure of the local authorities; would not the proceedings before the juries, in the long run, be more expensive than the proceedings before the arbitrator?—I am not sure; I cannot tell you that. The honourable Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works would know more about that than I do.

456. Would you allow claims for a small amount to go before a jury?—I would allow freeholders' and leaseholders' claims to go to a jury.

457. But suppose the leaseholders' claims are for a small amount. We all know a very small payment per annum may constitute a leaseholder's interest?—I should allow any one who had a greater interest than a three years' agreement to bring his claim before a jury.

458. Surely the expense of a large number of these coming before a jury would be greater than going before the arbitrator, would it not?—I should think it would; but if you are going to take away the claimant's property I think you ought to give him the option.

459. I understood your proposal to limit the expense to the local authorities in working the Act, but if this particular process is likely to result in a larger expense in the way of costs, it would surely operate in the opposite direction?—I do not say that one particular part of my scheme would save expense; I mean that the whole scheme together would do so.

460. Still this proposal was one main point in your scheme?—The main point of the scheme was to make it final, and not to have an appeal from the arbitrator; that the claimant should have the election of having his case decided by the jury or by the standing arbitrator, but he should have no appeal from either.

461. You think he should have no appeal from you to a jury?—Or from the jury to any one else.

462. Therefore you say that, although the costs of the proceedings before a jury where the parties take that course, might be more expensive, yet by cutting off the appeal from you to the jury, you would be limiting another source of expense?—Yes, and a source of considerable expense; if there were many appeals, which I am happy to say in my case does not appear to have been the case, though I did not know it until the last time I was here.

463. I understood you to say on Monday last that you did not altogether agree with the policy of the Act as explained to you by your legal

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

advisers as to compensation for trade?—I did not agree with the gentlemen who advised me, because I did not think it was just.

464. Therefore, in your decisions, you included compensation for trades?—Yes.

465. And you left it to the local authorities to appeal against it if they thought fit?—Exactly.

466. Has that compensation for trades formed a large item in your awards?—Not relatively a large item, I cannot tell you what proportion they bear. Besides, a great many of these trade cases were settled by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and did not come before me at all.

467. But where they did come before you, did the compensation for trades form a large item?—I could not say they did, looking at the total amount.

468. But in some trade cases was not that so?—I cannot tell you that.

469. Let me ask you to turn to the Appendix. At page 335 I see there is a case where, under the name of "Vincent" in the Whitechapel scheme, there was a lease for 3¾ years at 165 *l.* per annum, and the sum awarded in that case amounted to 4,560 *l.* Is that a case in which compensation for trade was included?—Yes, I should certainly say so. I presume it was a public-house.

470. Under the definition of the Act supplied to you by your legal advisers, that amount would not have been payable, I presume?—Not all of that.

471. Whatever is included in the way of trade compensation in that amount would not have been given had you acted upon their definition?—Quite so.

472. Supposing that an alternative was offered to these people of another position, or a similar position in the same district, would it not be reasonable then that they should only have the value of their premises, and not compensation for trade?—It would only be reasonable if the place, in the opinion of the arbitrator, was suitable for the carrying on of their trade. In that case they would clearly not be entitled to more than the expense of removal, and the loss incident to the removal from one part of the street to another. The local authority did in point of fact put before me as arbitrator a particular house in White-cross-street, in that way. I think there were some new shops on the opposite side of the street which were brought to my notice. When I inquired into the rent of those shops I found it was rather an argument in favour of the claimant; because he said, "they want me to go over there, but I shall have to pay 200 *l.* a year rent for that, whereas my present house I have got at 150 *l.* a year."

Chairman.

473. I am told you have made a mistake accidentally about Vincent's case, and that there was no question of trade compensation there?—I find that Vincent was the freeholder, and that the property was let on lease for an unexpired term of 3¾ years at 165 *l.* per annum.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

474. Take the case of Tanner, No. 336?—The term is 19¼ years, unexpired; 30 *l.* a year; the amount awarded 1,500 *l.*

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

475. I presume that 1,500 *l.* includes trade compensation?—I have no doubt it does.

476. Would it be possible, in your opinion, that the local authority should deal with part of the area which has been condemned, build houses there suitable for the population which are about to be turned out, and then offer those houses to the persons engaged in these similar trades, with a view of reducing the compensation to be paid to them?—I think that would be a possible scheme, and in my examination on Monday I suggested that the Board of Works should have been permitted to build some of these houses.

477. You suggested then that they should have a general power to build?—That was under different circumstances. Speaking of the arrangements between the Peabody Trustees and the Metropolitan Board of Works, I suggested that before any decision had been come to as to letting the land at all for these purposes the Metropolitan Board of Works should have built some houses and have seen how they let, what class of persons got into them, and what probable rental might be got for them.

478. Confining yourself to the case of a special area condemned under this Act that we are considering, would it be possible that the local authority should deal with a portion of that area, build a block of houses upon it, and then offer those houses to the other people about to be turned out?—That is quite possible, but that is a question entirely for Parliament to deal with.

479. But if that course were adopted would it reduce the claim for compensation, or reduce the amounts awarded for compensation to trades?—That depends entirely on the circumstances of the case afterwards. I cannot say; probably it might, but I will not be very strong about that till I know all the features of the case itself.

480. I think you have stated that all the awards you have given were before the Act of 1879?—I believe so. Some of the awards were given after 1879, because some of them are dated 1880; but I believe all the proceedings were before the Act of 1879.

481. Supposing that Act had been in existence earlier, would it have made much difference in the amount awarded by you?—I cannot speak with any confidence about that, because I have not tried that Act yet; but as far as I can judge I think I have anticipated it in making my awards, because as I have said in my evidence before, if I found a house unfit for human habitation I did not deal with it as a house, but I dealt with it as ground.

482. Do you go so far as to say that you have taken into account the principles contained in that Act in your awards?—I believe so. If the Act is to be read as not a confiscating Act, but as giving reasonable and fair compensation to men for their property, I believe I have done so.

483. May I ask on what principle you have estimated the value of reversioners' property; have you estimated reversioners' property in all cases with any regard to the present condition of the property?—The reversioners interest sometimes

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

sometimes is a question of land only and not houses.

484. Let us take a case where the reversioners interests are of different degrees, that is to say, some reversioners after a three years' lease, some after a five years' lease, some after a 10 years' lease, and some after a 20 years' lease. Have you, in estimating the value of those interests, had regard to the present condition of the property, or have you valued them in all cases as absolutely the freehold value of the land?—I have valued them having regard to the condition of the property and the probable duration of it. Sometimes a block of houses would come to more as land than the rack value of the houses if they could be maintained.

485. I presume the prospective value of property as to which there is only a three years' lease to run, would depend to some extent on the adjoining bad property which may have 20 or 30 years to run?—It would to a certain extent.

486. Have you taken that into account in your awards?—Yes.

Mr. *William Holms.*

487. With regard to the question of compensation to people carrying on business, I should like to ask you one or two questions; supposing a man stated to you that he had an income of 400 *l.* or 500 *l.* a year for so many years, what do you do in the way of getting proof?—He has to produce his books, if he has any.

488. Do you ever ask him to produce his income tax receipts?—Never.

489. Would it not be a good thing to do that when the amount was such as to bring him within it?—I have never in the whole course of the long experience I have had of arbitrations asked for it, because it is not reliable at any time. I had an instance in a compensation case not very long ago where a man was found to be not making a profit of 200 *l.* a year, yet his counsel put into my hands two receipts from the Inland Revenue for a payment on 500 *l.* a year profits, in anticipation of his house being required.

490. What principle do you go upon usually as to giving one, two, three or more years' profits?—I should look to the duration of the lease to begin with; the character of the trade, and the loss that would be sustained by removal. To some men who have got a local business, such as a greengrocer, or baker, or a milkman who has got a walk, and men of that sort, who have to go away from a neighbourhood, probably, and get another connection, I give more than to another man who could carry his trade into another neighbourhood without losing that class of business.

491. You take into consideration, in fact, the nature and circumstances of the business carried on?—Certainly.

492. But do you take into consideration this point also, whether the same man, say a tobacconist, might not take a shop round the corner in another street, or at a very moderate distance?—Yes, if it can be shown that there is a possibility of doing that (and it is the business of the promoters of the undertaking in conducting a case of that kind to bring under my notice that there is such a place to which this man may go),

Mr. *William Holms*—continued.

the question then would be only, as the Right honourable Member for Reading said, is the place suitable, and can he carry on his business there. That is a matter for the discretion of the arbitrator.

493. I should like to ask a question with regard to the Whitechapel district; you stated that the amount of claims sent in to you was 153,000 *l.*, and the amount awarded was 93,300 *l.* roundly?—Yes.

494. Can you give the Committee any idea of the proportion of claims not sent in which you yourself had to make out?—You will see that by comparing the sum awarded in regard to the claims received with my final award. My final award in that case was 130,000 *l.*

495. It is the difference between the 130,000 *l.* and the 95,000 *l.*?—Yes.

Chairman.

496. The chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works did not quite understand what you meant about their having powers to build upon certain areas?—I did not say that, I think. I did not make myself understood. What I say is they ought to have the power that is given to the local authority under the sections to which I have referred in Mr. Torrens' Act of 1879, under which the local authority can shut up, pull down, and compensate for houses that are not fit for human habitation. Those clauses in Mr. Torrens' Act of 1879, give them the power to build up again, and to make bye-laws for the regulation of the people who are to live in these houses.

497. Do you mean to confine that power to rebuilding within the area represented as unhealthy or elsewhere?—Anywhere.

498. But only for the purpose of supplying houses?—Barracks; not houses.

499. For those persons who have been dislodged from those unhealthy areas?—Or otherwise.

500. For the purpose of housing those persons who have been dislodged?—Not only that, but to meet the pressing wants of the poor population of this metropolis. There ought to be, according to my humble opinion, receptacles under a proper management where these very poor, wretched people can go, instead of going even to a registered lodging-house, and perhaps a great many of them sleeping under arches and sleeping on doorsteps, and being miserable and badly clad, and cold. There ought to be a receptacle something better than the workhouse for the casual poor, where a man who can save a little out of his two days' work, or something of that sort, in the week, can get a bed in a decent place, and I believe that they would be able to go into these places and have a bed there for 3 *d.* or 4 *d.* With regard to these registered lodging-houses, during the investigation I have had to make in these London cases a man who had been manager at one of them, the landlord, in fact, told me that many men had been there probably for a month together; and there was one case, I remember, down in Pye-street, where an old blind man and his wife had lived together for several years in one room set apart for them, and paid

Chairman—continued.

6 *d.* a night. He went out every day with his wife to beg, and came back to sleep.

501. Do you know anything at all about whether the Corporation of the City of Glasgow have erected barracks of that kind?—I have no knowledge.

502. Cubicles?—I have not seen the barracks at Glasgow, but my idea is cubicles, and I believe, if I may be permitted to express an opinion upon it, that if it cost the ratepayers money in the end, it would save money in workhouses and prisons. I say that from my intimate acquaintance with the working classes. There is one observation that I omitted to make, and I was not asked the question, but I think it right to mention it, and that is as regards the 10 per cent. I should not prohibit it, but I would leave it to the discretion of the arbitrator or the jury. There are cases where I think 10 per cent. ought to be allowed.

503. You think the Act is too stringent on that point?—I do; I have never allowed it. I have always obeyed the Act of Parliament as far as I could, except in cases where it was admitted that the property was taken, not because it was unhealthy, but because it was necessary to take it for the scheme itself.

504. Then you are allowed to give the 10 per cent. by the Act?—It does not say so, but it is to be inferred from the Act.

Mr. Frederick William Goddard, called in; and Examined.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

505. Will you kindly tell the Committee what has been your experience with the Metropolitan Board of Works?—I am the chief surveyor to the Board, and I have had 20 years' experience in all the Board's improvements, estimates of value, and so on.

506. Had you had previous experience before you joined the Board as a land surveyor?—I was in practice for myself 10 years; I was manager to the firm of Musgrave & Gadsden, which is now represented by the present lord mayor, for five years prior to that.

507. Have you been engaged since the passing of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875, in advising the Metropolitan Board of Works upon the various official representations made by the medical officers, and in preparing the preliminary estimates of the cost of purchasing properties included in the schemes?—I have.

508. Did you attend all the local inquiries made by Mr. Cubitt Nichols under the direction of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and did you give evidence upon those occasions?—Yes.

509. Did you advise the Board as to the purchase of the various properties included in the schemes, after their confirmation by Act of Parliament?—I not only advised the Board, but I gave evidence before the arbitrators who were appointed.

510. Can you tell us about the first scheme, the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme, which was confirmed by Act of Parliament, and received the Royal Assent on 12th August 1876; will you give me the estimate you prepared of the cost of the land, and Sir Joseph Bazalgette's estimate of the cost of roads and sewers?—This scheme, the first attempted to be carried out by the Board, was confirmed by Parliament on the 12th of August 1876, and taking the Parliamentary Estimate, the cost of land was put at 100,000 *l.*; the cost of roads and sewers, 10,500 *l.*, less recoupment, 56,100 *l.*; net cost, 54,400 *l.*

511. Did not this area comprise some of the most wretched property in the metropolis, as well as a better class of property required for the purposes of air, ventilation, and approaches?—The courts I have down here, viz., Hairbrain, Parsons, Green-yard, Black Jack-alley, Will-yard, Rose-court, Sun-court, Slater's, Crown-row and Cooper's-court, Shorter's-rents and Cherubim-court, were the most horrible you could possibly imagine; I calculated on one occasion, in one of these courts, the total value of the materials on the ground, and putting a most favourable construction on it, the whole of the six houses would not have fetched 50 *l.* I did not expect I should have any lead to sell; I did not put that in because that would disappear.

512. In making your estimate, had you regard to the fact that the Act expressly directs that the compensation shall be governed by the market value?—Well, market value is almost like the algebraical X, an unknown quantity; and it was a most difficult thing to ascertain what market value meant. If I had no interpretation of this, I should take market value to mean what such property if produced at the auction mart would sell legitimately for; and what price it would fetch I considered that when the property was so far gone bad, and in so unsatisfactory a state both from the decay of the material from the absorption of damp, from the practical impossibility of restoring it in any way except pulling it absolutely down and re-building it, in that case only the value of the ground and materials should be given. Wherever houses were in a condition that they could by some amount of expenditure be brought into a fit state, then I considered that expenditure should be deducted; but there was one provision in this Act on the basis of which I was instructed to make my valuation which took no account of trade compensation. It was estimated that, except for removal of trade, no compensation should be given for the acquisition of the trade as in an ordinary Lands Clauses Act compensation.

513. Can you explain to the Committee the instances in which under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845, it has frequently been the practice in cases of street improvement for the promoters to give compensations exceeding the market value of the land taken?—Yes. Unfortunately the practice of the two great men, Mr.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

Mr. Justice Hawkins, as he is now, and Mr. John Horatio Lloyd was, I expect to save trouble, to reduce everything to a rule-of-thumb compensation, that was to take all freehold property, whether good, bad, or indifferent, at 20 years' purchase, and all leasehold property in the same category at 16 years' purchase; and I need not tell you and the honourable gentlemen assembled that in the last case, in a surveyor's eyes, such a computation is absolutely out of the way altogether, because that has been increased from 10 to 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and up to 25, and depressed in the same manner, and therefore to take an absolute rule-of-thumb is impossible. I have endeavoured to break this down, and with the aid of the solicitor we have always got the question asked in the witness box after the compensation value has been given, what is the absolute market value; what would this realise if it were taken by an auctioneer of experience into the open market; but we have great difficulty when proceeding in Lands Clauses compensation cases to get a jury to look at it in the light in which it practically should be looked at.

Chairman.

514. Then you are aware that one of the great objects of that clause in this Act of Parliament of 1875 was to break down all that system which had grown up?—Quite so, and it has been; because there has been no computation made or any assessment of value in any one scheme upon the same basis as an improvement scheme in the ordinary way. No freeholder in the condemned area has been given more than 16 years' purchase, and the cases of leaseholders have been computed at 14, 12, and 10.

515. So far the Act has worked well?—So far the Act has been beneficial.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

516. Can you explain the principles you adopted in estimating the value of the properties in the unhealthy area as contrasted with the value of the property not open to objection upon sanitary grounds?—Well, I think I have explained that in my previous answer. When they are perfectly insanitary, and cannot be remedied, then I take the bare value of the land and the materials on the ground as materials to be pulled down. Where they can be remedied I take them at a fair commutation, such as the leasehold interest from 12 to 14 years' purchase, being 8 per cent. and 7 per cent. respectively, and I deduct from that the cost of putting those into a condition to answer the covenants of a lease. Then the viler kind of property which we are obliged to buy which comes intermediately between that I put on a 10 per cent. table, after taking all the deductions for rates, taxes, and incidentals. The ordinary assumption for that is 35 per cent., but I have endeavoured for a very long period, and I think at last I have induced those who have been associated with me, to take them at 50 per cent. You know we have had in the earlier days property which has come into our hands, and which we have been obliged to keep up till the Home Secretary gave us power to pull down, and we have found after giving a fair allowance for the incidents of loss, and so on, that we really have a deduction of 50 per cent. on the gross income.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

517. What class of persons do you find are in the habit of acquiring, for investment, small tenemental property in the unhealthy areas, and how are such properties usually let?—Well, the answer to that is the very curse that is incident on all society; the middle men, the small men, go into it to make a profit, and screw the poor wretched holders down to the last farthing; in fact, they get as much as they can out of the property, and do as little as they can. We have had, as you know from its coming before you, the incident of one man who owns, or did own (he has gone now, and taken his "flight", Thomas Flight), property in every part of London, and the squalid nature of that property, the wretched condition in which it has been kept, the avoidance of all decent rules by which habitations are governed was something very fearful. There was one place in Lincoln-court, Drury-lane; the property was in that fearful condition that the moment the Board became possessed of it by having paid the money, the property was pulled down. We got an order from the Secretary of State to permit us to do so; and when I tell you that the staircases were made into waterclosets, that the ordinary waterclosets were filled up with dust as being the nearest thing to push down, that the places were inhabited by the very vilest of the vile, you may imagine it was perfectly unmarketable. The lessee had taken the property to expend 2,000 *l.* upon it at an indefinite period. He never had expended 2,000 *l.*, and he had the power under the lease to expend it whensoever he pleased. Well, with all due respect to the distinguished gentlemen who have acted as arbitrators, I was not supported, I will admit, by Mr. Vigers or anybody else; I went in myself alone: and I claimed it as being such a property that the owner was only entitled to one year's profit upon it, 500 *l.* to 700 *l.*; but the award was 3,500 *l.* I do hope that some amendment of the Act will take place to prevent a man getting a large derivative income from property he never has any right to hold at all, it being a nuisance to society.

Chairman.

518. What kind of amendment would you suggest?—I should say that wherever land or houses were unfit for human habitation, and that should be proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioners appointed by yourselves, in the first instance a more exhaustive inquiry should take place before him, that when that inquiry had placed those houses and that property in the category I have mentioned, those houses only should be paid for on the footing of the materials and land.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

519. Are the poor rates, taxes, and water rates usually paid by the landlord, or by the tenant?—They are always paid by the landlord in these cases of small intermediate proprietors.

520. In making your estimate for the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme, how did you treat the question of the amounts which would have to be expended to put the tenements in proper

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

proper repair?—Well, I took in the first category those that could not be put into repair. Then I took the second, and taking the rentals, I took such a basis as would allow of an expenditure to bring them up to a 12 years' purchase and 8 per cent. table.

521. You have given us an instance in Lincoln-court?—I condemned that entirely.

522. You have had a great many other very bad cases?—Very bad indeed; all those courts I told you of are almost as bad.

523. I think some were very bad in Whitechapel?—I have given you a list of courts and alleys which were very bad.

524. If you assume that such property is put into repair, would not you value it at a greater number of years' purchase than in its existing dilapidated condition?—It raises it from 10 years' purchase, which is 10 per cent., to 12 and 14 years' purchase, which is respectively 8 per cent. and 7 per cent.

525. You have given one instance of a landlord who got a large income from bad property; in your experience have you found a good many others who have followed that bad example?—Unfortunately, it is the case, and they chiefly belong to small tradesmen who invest their little savings in property of this kind.

526. Is it not the fact that both under the agreements and awards the owners of the property in the unhealthy area do obtain sums considerably more than the market value; you have given us one instance, perhaps you will give us some more?—I think I could give you a good many, but I am afraid to admit we have had to pay more than we consider the market value of a great many of them.

527. You could not help yourselves?—We could not help ourselves.

528. Is it not a fact that before the standing arbitrator, and before juries the claimants' witnesses put in valuations greatly in excess of the real value of the property taken, and can you quote some instances of such excessive valuations?—It does not advance one's estimate of human nature when one has much to do with compensations; the elasticity of the consciences of surveyors is something awful; I will give you one or two cases in the Goulston-street, the Essex-road, and Whitecross-street schemes?—We did not appeal in any case under Sir Henry Hunt, because we left, in the Whitechapel scheme, the entire matter to him.

529. That was the first block?—Yes, we took that as an example, but in the case of the Goulston-street scheme there was, first of all, Windus and Collins; the claimant's claim was 6,294 *l.*, the provisional award was 3,433 *l.*, the final award was 5,700 *l.*, the Board's valuation 4,000 *l.*; an appeal to the jury was made, and the result was 4,250 *l.*; that is one of Mr. Rodwell's cases. Then Yoakley's Charity Trustees, 56, Wentworth-street, and 120, George-street; the claimants' valuation 4,319 *l.*, the provisional award 1,500 *l.*, the final award 3,039 *l.*, our valuation was 3,000 *l.*; of course, we agreed to that. Then Devine, 92 and 93, Middlesex-street, and 1 to 7, Marlborough-court; in that case the claimant's evidence was 2,868 *l.*, the provisional award

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

1,372 *l.*, the final award 2,300 *l.*; but upon talking to the gentlemen they subsequently agreed, instead of going to a jury, to accept 1,650 *l.*, the Board's valuation being 1,320 *l.*; so that it was a compromise there as you see, but at an amount considerably less than the amount of the final award. Then the next I have is Joseph, a fishmonger; he was fishmonger to the Master of the Rolls, Baron Rothschild, and all the Jewish nobility; the claimant's evidence was 6,201 *l.*, the provisional award 1,650 *l.*, the final award, after hearing the appellants, was 4,000 *l.*, the Board's valuation was 3,400 *l.*, and I got them to accept 3,600 *l.* Then Thurgood, 1 to 12, Commercial-court; the claim was 2,450 *l.*, the provisional award 1,200 *l.*, the final award 2,100 *l.*, and on going to a jury they gave 1,900 *l.* Then in the Essex-road scheme there was the case of Smeeton, where the claim was 1,400 *l.*, the provisional award 1,320 *l.*, the final award 1,100 *l.*, and that was reduced upon appeal. The Board's valuation was 750 *l.*, and they took 800 *l.* Then Bennett's Trustees, Elder-walk; the claim was 27,195 *l.*, the provisional award was 18,237 *l.*, the final award 20,500 *l.*, the Board's valuation 16,000 *l.*, and the jury gave 17,750 *l.*, or 10,000 *l.* less than the original claim.

Chairman.

530. Can you account for the great increase in that case between the provisional award and the final award?—I am afraid that the arbitrator upon that occasion was led away by the speciousness of the claimant's surveyors. I do not want to say anything that would make me liable to an action for libel, but there are some men who will swear to anything, and they think nothing apparently of the honour of an oath, and the obligation of an oath. A man will get into the witness box, and swear that the property is worth more than I profess to obtain for it after the whole improvement is completed, and I can give you instances where men have sworn upon a trial that property is worth so much per foot, and I have offered it to them after the improvement has been done at one-third of what they swore it was worth, and they would not accept it. Then going to the Whitecross-street scheme, there was the case of Jones, in Hartshorn-court. In that case the claim was 11,000 *l.*, and the provisional award 7,500 *l.* Sir H. Hunt reduced it to 6,500 *l.* on the final award, but the Board still objected; their valuation was 3,500 *l.*, and we got 5,000 *l.* from the jury. In the case of Long's Trustees the claim was 9,782 *l.*; 7,800 *l.* was the provisional award, 6,860 *l.* the final award, and I see that has not been further dealt with. Then there was the case of Joseph Storey and others, in Gloucester-square. In that case the claim was 47,000 *l.*, but when they came to the evidence, they could only produce evidence up to 24,700 *l.*; the Board's valuation was 20,834 *l.*, the provisional award was 19,030 *l.*, and upon appeal the award was 19,750 *l.*, and we accepted that of course. It was a little under our own, but the reduction from 47,052 *l.* to 19,750 *l.* is rather considerable.

531. Then

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

531. Then I may take it from you that the members of the Board themselves, and their officers, have very long and very serious difficulties to deal with, and have to give an enormous amount of attention to them to carry out these Acts at all?—It is not for me to boast, or to speak of the work of the Board; all I can say is, that it is a work of intense anxiety, intense trouble, and involving complicated labour. These schemes have given not only the members of the Board, and you yourself, a vast amount of trouble, a vast amount of consideration, and a vast amount of desire to carry them out loyally to the Legislature, who have imposed the duty on us, but as far as the officers are concerned, it is a matter for you to deal with, and not for us.

532. Will you state the actual result of purchase of properties, under agreements or awards, for the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme?—You mean the net result. There was a loss upon the original estimate of 65,000 *l.*; that is, a loss after deducting the fair amount for the recoupment; the estimate was exceeded by 65,000 *l.*

533. The net result exceeded by 65,000 *l.* the original estimate; was not that the case?—That is so.

534. Will you state the original estimate, as contrasted with the net cost incurred by the Board, in the acquirement of property for each of the schemes deposited, stating in each instance the estimated cost of land, the estimated cost of roads and sewers, the estimated recoupment, with the actual amounts agreed to be paid, the actual amounts awarded by the standing arbitrator, or by juries on appeals from the final awards of the arbitrators, and the actual amounts to be received by way of recoupment. I think you have a table as to that?—I have a table, and a short statement as well. In the Whitechapel scheme the cost of land, according to the estimate, was 100,000 *l.*; the cost of roads and sewers, 10,500 *l.*; recoupment, 56,000 *l.*; the net cost, 54,400 *l.* The amount of settlement by arbitration was 130,741 *l.*; and in addition to that there was 9,571 *l.* worth of property purchased by agreement. We have now sold to the Peabody Trustees 68,299 feet superficial for 10,000 *l.*, and the remainder is in hand.

Chairman.

535. What proportion does the remainder bear to what you have sold?—We have sold one-third; we have got in hand 172,700 feet superficial. Then the next is Bedfordbury; the estimate of the cost of land for that was 83,565 *l.*; the cost of roads and sewers, 2,970 *l.*; the recoupment, 22,540 *l.*; the net cost, 63,995 *l.* The amount of settlement by the Board in that case has been 36,985 *l.*; settlement by arbitration, 37,769 *l.*; in all, 74,754 *l.*; and we have in hand a recoupment of 8,886 *l.*, or rather we have received that from the Peabody Trustees; that is the 3 *d.* a foot at 20 years' purchase.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

536. How much have you remaining over?—We have sold it all; we sold one piece for 920 *l.*, as a commercial piece, at the top of New-street.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

537. Your estimated loss was 63,900 *l.*?—That is so. Then the Goulston-street and Flower and Dean street scheme; the original estimate of cost of land, 267,629 *l.*; estimated cost of roads and sewers, 20,000 *l.*; and the recoupment there was taken at 139,856 *l.*; the net cost was estimated at 147,773 *l.*; the amount of settlements made by the Board was 132,022 *l.*; the amount of settlement by arbitration, 169,602 *l.*; making a total of 301,624 *l.* We have not as yet dealt with any of that. Then St. George the Martyr; the estimated cost of land, 56,520 *l.*; the cost of roads and sewers, 3,240 *l.*; recoupments, 26,407 *l.*; net cost, 33,353 *l.*; amount of settlement by the Board, 26,324 *l.*; amount of settlement by arbitration, 25,171 *l.*; making the cost of land 51,495 *l.*, as against an estimated cost of 33,000 *l.* We made only one appeal, and that was forced upon us. We should not have made that appeal, but the claimant claimed it. It was a case of a keeper of a lodging-house, and 850 *l.* was awarded in his favour.

Chairman.

538. You say this is an estimate of the loss upon roads?—No; the loss upon land.

539. What I wanted to ask was this: can you give any information as to the amount of the particular plot which has been used for widening the street?—I will give you all that in one moment. I have another table. I can give you every inch of the ground thrown on the public streets. Then Great Wild-street; original estimate of cost of land, 85,035 *l.*; estimated cost of roads and sewers, 2,540 *l.*; recoupment, 38,035 *l.*; net estimated cost, 49,540 *l.* The amount of settlement by the Board was only 7,800 *l.*, and the amount of settlement by arbitration was 79,855 *l.*, making a total of 87,685 *l.*; and then there was a further amount of land purchased by agreement, ordered by the Commissioner appointed by the Government to be purchased, which cost us 17,450 *l.*, by which we made that scheme complete. Then Whitecross-street; original estimate of cost of land, 251,836 *l.*; estimated cost of roads and sewers, 23,400 *l.*; estimated recoupment, 176,450 *l.*; estimated net cost, 98,786 *l.*; amount of settlement by Board, 103,464 *l.*; amount of settlement by arbitration, 220,938 *l.*; in all, 324,402 *l.*

540. Perhaps you had better put that table in?—I will do so. I may say, roughly, that the total amount agreed to in settlement by the Board themselves was 421,677 *l.*, and by arbitration 807,179 *l.* (*Table handed in.*)

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

541. Have you another table in your hand following that last one?—Here is a table showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the percentage on gross cost. (*Table handed in.*)

Chairman.

542. That has not got the amount occupied by streets?—The value of the land thrown into the public streets is 130,906 *l.* of the whole area.

543. All the schemes?—Yes.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

544. With regard to the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme, the Board left the settlement of every case to Sir Henry Hunt, the standing arbitrator?—Yes.

545. They did that for the purpose of seeing what principles the standing arbitrator adopted in making his valuations in the first case of the application of the Act?—Yes.

546. Is it not the case that the existence of numerous trade claims is a great element of uncertainty in estimating the net cost of any schemes under the Artizans' Acts, and is it not almost impossible for the Board or for their standing arbitrator to test the actual amount of profit made by persons carrying on trade in properties acquired for the scheme?—In the small cases very few of them keep any books at all, and you have to judge of the honesty of the statements by the surroundings. They very seldom produce any income tax receipts, for they pay none. You have averments made before the arbitrator and before yourself of incomes which, looking at the houses they live in, are absolutely preposterous. They are investigated, as you know, by your own accountant, who gives you a report of what he considers, looking at all the circumstances, may be taken as the annual income of the man, and upon that the Board either deal with it or refer it to the arbitrator; there are no books.

547. Have not very large amounts of compensation been paid by the Board in respect of licensed public-houses, and can you furnish the Committee with some instances of the amounts paid for licensed public-houses or beer shops?—Yes, I have prepared a table of that. We had to take a public-house called the "Old Justice," in Mint-street, Borough; the Board's valuation amounted to 5,700 *l.*, the provisional award to 2,900 *l.* the final award to 7,100 *l.*, which represented the value of the freehold, and nine years' purchase on the profits put forward by the claimant, or 10 years on the profits estimated by the Board. In the Great Wild-street scheme there was the "Red Lion," which cost us, freehold and leasehold, 9,100 *l.* In the Goulston-street scheme, the "Bull's Head" cost us 4,300 *l.*; The "Princess Alice" also cost us 6,600 *l.*, and there is the freehold in addition, some 3,000 *l.* I will hand this table in. (*The same was handed in.*)

548. Does it not frequently happen that, with respect to the worst class of tenements, the value of the site of the buildings exceeds the value of the tenements standing upon such site, and that the case is presented in this form to the arbitrator?—Yes; and there is the difficulty where you have an isolated block, or two blocks, in the centre of surroundings, those blocks being themselves exceedingly bad, and requiring to be pulled down, it is very certain that the market prices of those blocks, or of the sites which they occupy would, only be the same as if they were isolated in this particular locality; but the general way of putting the case is, that because Johnson has given for a block with some degree of frontage 2*s.* a foot, therefore, this being in immediate contiguity, would, no doubt, be purchased by him at some future time, and the same amount given for it, although *qua* the ground and block it may not be worth, perhaps, above 6*d.*

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

I am afraid that is in consequence of one clause of the Act, which says, "all circumstances being considered." I think that is the language of the market value clause, and I am afraid that gives what might be called a valuation of contingent probabilities, which is at all times a difficult thing to get; that is supposing anybody brought out a building scheme for this particular area, what he might feel inclined to give for this particular site; but if the price was to be limited to what then was the value of the *locus in quo* in the light of a building site, I think that difficulty would be got rid of.

Chairman.

549. I think those were the words put in by the late Mr. Cawley, if I remember right?—I think they were; they have given rise to all manner of difficulties, unfortunately.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

550. Would not the sites when cleared, in many instances, realise for commercial purposes a sum per superficial foot greatly in excess of the amounts which such sites are worth, with the obligation of continuing and erecting thereon artizan's dwellings?—Yes, very considerably.

551. Can you furnish the Committee with your valuation of the various sites acquired by the Board if let or sold for commercial purposes?—I have not got that; I can tell you this, that taking the Whitechapel, which you have let for 2*d.*, that would be worth from 9*d.* to a shilling.

552. It is let for 3*d.*?—At 2*d.* it does, but take it at 3*d.* all over for Whitechapel.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

553. How would the total have worked out as compared with the actual cost if used for commercial purposes?—We should have done it almost at a profit.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

554. At 9*d.* a foot?—Yes; I think you will find by the return I have put in it comes out to 11*s.* 6*d.*, with all interests. I have no doubt we should have got for commercial purposes 10*s.*; so that we should have only had a margin of 1*s.* 6*d.*, and therefore one would balance the other almost.

555. Does not the fact that such sites are worth greatly more for commercial purposes than for the purpose of artizans' dwellings render it essential, that the condition of letting for artizans' dwellings should be of a stringent character so as to prevent the lessee appropriating the sites in a more profitable manner?—In all our lettings we always impose conditions of a stringent character. They are exercised by us with leniency and forbearance to those who are our lessees, and we never have any complaints, but in all cases of any tender that we received, our improvements or lettings are all subject to the provision and direction of the superintending architect, who is made sole arbitrator. The same thing occurs with regard to your large contracts. The engineer there is made the sole arbitrator, and unless you had something definitive like that you would always get into trouble, therefore your conditions are stringent.

556. Do

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

556. Do you consider the provision in the Act of Parliament that upon each site cleared, accommodation for the number of persons displaced shall be provided, imposes onerous conditions upon the lessees?—They take it on the condition that they shall house the number displaced, and they know perfectly well how many they will have to provide for; therefore they take it with all conditions, and the price is ruled accordingly.

557. Is not the Great Wild-street area, Drury-lane, an instance, where there was great difficulty in erecting sufficient tenements to accommodate the number of persons displaced?—You had to put an additional storey on that in order to accommodate them.

558. How many storeys did that make?—I think there are six storeys there. The people were very closely packed there.

559. Will you explain to the Committee the attempt made by the Board to let the Whitechapel and Limehouse area before the tender of the Peabody Trustees was accepted?—I have a memorandum here, "13th January 1879, no tender received, letter from Sir Sydney Waterlow; revised condition 31st March; 7th April, was ordered to be offered by public auction by Messrs. Moore & Co., who put it up on the 12th June. On the 26th May, prior to that, the Peabody Trustees offered 3 *d.* per foot for six sites. On the 12th June Messrs. Moore put the property up, and we had practically no bidding, and it was bought in. A bidding was afterwards made on the second day by a man named Hough, of 500 *l.* a year and 20 years' purchase, which made 12,500 *l.*; but negotiations were then pending with the Peabody Trustees, and it was taken over at the sum of 10,000 *l.*, with all the rest which they then took at 3 *d.* per foot; and having regard to the large area which the Peabody Trustees took, the importance of that body, and the pressure brought to bear, and the letter which was sent from Lord Derby at the time, we thought we could not get any more. It was less than our estimate, but in order to show the loyalty of the Board to the carrying out of the scheme, and to cover the ground as quickly as possible, the Board accepted and closed the transaction. I do not know whether I am under the necessity of putting in Lord Derby's letter; I have a copy here.

560. That is a copy of Lord Derby's letter to me?—Yes, stating that their ultimatum was that which we accepted. (*The same was handed in.*)

561. Do you consider the sum of 3*d.* per superficial foot agreed to be paid by the Peabody Trustees for the areas let to them, their full market value, having regard to the obligation to erect and perpetually to continue thereon artizans' dwellings?—I look at the large area that was dealt with. If I had to break it up into isolated sections, 3*d.* per foot would not, as I have advised the Board, be my idea of its value. I thought 4*d.* and 22 years' purchase; but when I had regard to the extent of the arrangement of the Peabody Trustees, to their immediate capacity for building at once upon the place, to the necessity of their re-housing these parties concerned, I then felt it to be unadvisable to recommend your body to refuse so available an offer, and under the circumstances I think you have got the commercial value of the property.

562. Can you give me a list of the areas comprised in the agreement for letting to the Peabody Trustees?—I know which they are. They are Old Pye-street, Bedfordbury, Peartree-court, Whitecross-street, Great Wild-street, and a part of the Whitechapel and Limehouse—one-third.

563. Do you consider that if the Board had not entered into the agreement with the Peabody Trustees it would have been difficult for the Board to have found persons ready to take the land under the conditions imposed?—The Board would have had the land on their hands for a very long time.

564. Has not the Board made inquiries as to the possibility of acquiring for artizans' dwellings other sites than those included in the schemes, and can you give particulars of the result of such inquiries?—The Board were a long time looking about for properties of this kind, and we made every inquiry. Such inquiries, of course, were limited as to the radius. It was no use taking people four or five miles off, as we thought at that period, and ultimately we acquired in 1879 the Red Lion Yard, Weaver's-lane; a large site in Pickle Herring Wharf, which will accommodate 1,000 people, and also Cherry Garden-street. We have not acquired any sites under the Artizans' Dwellings Bill, the one we are now upon. We have not been able to do so, for it would have been a double expense. We are clearing ground for the reimposition of artizans; we should have had to have gone in order to put them within a reasonable distance of where they were then dwelling to a place just as crowded as that which they were then occupying, and it would have been the old game of the Irishman digging a hole to put the rubbish in which he dug out of another hole, and we should have had all the additional expense of paying for all the same classes of interest that were disturbed in the other area.

565. The Board would have had in those cases to pay the full commercial value for such sites?—Undoubtedly, and every interest upon it.

566. I think you have already told us that there would have been very great difficulty in getting them?—Very great.

567. So you consider that when the Board has obtained a conveyance of the tenements comprised in a scheme they should be authorised to remove the unhealthy tenements without delay?—They should be authorised to shut them up, and remove them as a focus of disease, and we have now authority from the Home Secretary to remove houses in any of our schemes wherever they have turned out to be unsanitary and centres of disease.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

568. Was that a general written authority?—We apply as the case transpires. We put the facts before him, and he gives us authority to close those houses and pull them down.

Chairman.

569. When did he begin to give that authority?—The moment he receives an application.

Sir *Henry T. Holland.*

570. But at what period was it given in last year?—It was subsequent to your report. The solicitor reminds me that that applies to cases of insanitation. Wherever there are cases of fever or infection (I have said insanitation, but I am now putting a stronger term), and where they would be a source of danger to the neighbourhood, then we get permission and power to pull them down.

571. I only wanted to know whether you got the permission before we reported last year?—I do not think we did.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

572. When such tenements are acquired by the Board, is it not almost impossible to keep the houses in tolerable repair and condition?—The inhabitants of the surrounding neighbourhood think they are entitled to remove what they have been formerly associated with, and they would take it bit by bit if we did not look after them, but it is almost impossible to keep them in anything like condition. The strange thing is that the moment the Board become landlords the local authorities wake up to a sense of their duties, and, while they never asked the former owner to do one tithe of what they ask the Board to do, they are down most strictly upon us, and demand of us to do things which, if we did them, would be like rebuilding the premises.

573. These are taken to pull down, and the local authorities come to tell you to repair them, not having done anything for a long period before?—They tell you your drains are wrong, and that you must reorganise them, and that you must repaint, repaper, and replaster, and do a lot of things, so that, in fact, unless some stoppage was put to it, we should have to expend a considerable sum on property which we were only going to hold for six months.

574. Then it would be a great waste of public money for the Metropolitan Board of Works to expend money in carrying out their views?—Decidedly.

575. Is it, in your judgment, proper that the ratepayers should pay the market value of tenements which are unfit for human habitation?—That is a question I have already expressed my strong opinion upon, that it should be only the ground value and the materials which stand upon it.

576. Is not the market value of such property greatly increased by the fact that no sufficiently stringent law is enforced for the purpose of compelling the owners to render the same fit for human habitation?—That is so. I have known in my own parish houses to be destitute of water for a couple of years, and the man who was the owner to be sitting as a vestryman administering the law of the parish. I have known the medical officer, although possessed by nature with a very handsome countenance and a large nose, to be unable to smell the stinks of Hunt's Bone Works, although in the immediate locality which he

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

walked through night and day, but it is human nature under its various phases and aspects. The medical officer is responsible to the vestry, who appoint him, and various interests are so mixed up, that he will very soon bring a hornet's nest round his ears, and if he attempted to do his duty strictly and independently, I only know he would be like a medical officer who, not so very long ago on the other side of the water, was got rid of in very quick time because he discovered that some of the vestrymen held some of these small houses which were in a wretched condition, and he demanded certain alterations to them which they did not think fit to carry out.

577. Will you state to the Committee the remedy which should, in your opinion, be applied for the purpose of preventing the continuance of such unhealthy tenements as are included in the representations of the various medical officers?—Well, my remedy, I am afraid, would be too drastic. I should make the Home Secretary appoint all the medical officers. I should make the medical officers responsible only to some central authority, and give that authority imperative power to enforce the requisitions upon proof by medical officers that such were required. But so long as vestrymen own little properties, and so long as their friends and relations do the same thing, and they are all mixed up in a friendly association, you can never have this thing thoroughly carried out.

578. Do you consider that the Artizans' Acts can be applied in cases where a small number of houses only are intended to be dealt with?—No. We have sometimes representations made of two or three houses, or three or four houses, but it is impossible to make a scheme out of so small an area as that.

579. In those cases the Metropolitan Board of Works has left them to the vestries to carry out?—They have done so.

580. Have you any occasion to consider the application of Mr. Torrens' Act?—I have never had the opportunity of dealing with that; it has not come within my cognizance.

581. If, for instance, in an area of an acre, 20 or 30 houses are condemned under these Acts, and shut up and removed, would there be difficulty in inducing persons to take the sites for the purpose of erecting new tenements?—Yes; because under the Building Act they would have to sacrifice some considerable area for light and approaches; and it would be perfectly unwise to permit the re-imposition of houses in narrow courts and approaches.

582. I presume you agree with me, if you acquire an area as large as the Whitechapel area, of which the Board took half at one time and half at another, it requires some large area where parties could lay out roads and streets before they could deal with it?—An area of something like from an acre and approaching to four acres.

583. Have you some information you would like to give the Committee with regard to the Artizans' Acts of 1875 or 1879, which I have not put to you?—No: but there is one thing which has suggested itself; there is a very valuable report, in my humble judgment, given in the Blue Book presented by your Committee, as to the various

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

various dealings with the Acts, and I should like to see that supplemented with what I have placed before you to-day, together with this; you know there is a large quantity of what are called bogus interests; a man gives another a letter, not an agreement or a legal document; but he gives him a letter: "So long as I live and hold the property, or so long as such-and-such a circumstance remains, you shall have, or I will undertake to give you, a 21 years' lease." It is perfectly well known that the 21 years' lease would not be taken up if we did not come along; but he imposes an interest which enables him to charge that estate as a value, having the rental ratified to him by a pseudo agreement; on the other hand, the tenant, if he has a trade, puts in this: "I have a 21 years' interest in this house, and, therefore, my trade cannot be assessed at half a year's computation; I am entitled to something considerably above that;" therefore, I would make it my humble submission that no interest either of lease, or agreement for a lease, should be considered valid if made after the Provisional Order had been publicly announced; that is to say, that after the intention to take it had become a subject of actual deposit in the House of Commons all leases should be considered invalid, provided that the Board carried out, within 12 months from the date of the Provisional Order, the scheme for which the Provisional Order was made. I do not think a man ought to be hung up for a long period; the Board might not go on with it, or might drop it; but I think wherever the Board carry out these schemes they should be protected from what are certainly swindles; there cannot be any other term for them. Then there was another matter which the solicitor has reminded me of if you will kindly bear with me; it appears from Mr. Richardson's evidence that he thinks nine months is a fair time to take after the final award has been given, within which the thing should be completed, and the land should be thrown open for public use; but if he had thought for a moment, he would have known perfectly well this, that after the final award has been made the solicitors for the claimant have to deliver their abstracts to the solicitor for the Board; that an investigation has to take place of the several titles adduced, and when I tell you that in one week some 500 abstracts were thrown pell mell into our Board, I need not tell you it would take a much larger staff than the Metropolitan Board of Works have to knock them off in nine months, for very often the solicitors on the side of the claimants delay answering requisitions, or, in fact, are unable to obtain an answer to the requisitions. A man may be in Australia or Canada, or may be in various parts of the world, and these things have to go out to him and get returned; therefore, the limitation that the honourable Member for Greenwich made as to the time within which these things should be carried out is really not practicable; if he had doubled that time he would have brought it within a period, perhaps, that would meet the circumstances of the case; I merely mention that, because it is not when you make a final award that you necessarily are in possession of the ground; possession of the ground only comes when every

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

deed and interest is got in, and all the money has been paid; I should like to hand in this, which is the alteration in the Whitechapel original tender, which Sir Sydney Waterlow objected to. (*The same handed in.*) Then this is a copy of the conditions of letting in Northumberland Avenue; they were exactly the same; one is almost a duplicate of the other, and the conditions which were excepted to are the customary stipulations endorsed on all the previous contracts. (*The same handed in.*)

Mr. *William Holms.*

584. You have given us various instances of the amount of compensation asked for in connection with trades, and the amount actually paid; I should like to know how the claim was made upon some of the cases; take the instance of the fishmonger to which you referred; you referred to a fishmonger who claimed 6,241 *l.*; the provisional amount awarded was 1,650 *l.*, the final amount awarded was 4,000 *l.*; the Board's valuation was 3,400 *l.*; and ultimately the sum of 3,600 *l.* was paid. Can you tell me how the original claim of 6,241 *l.* was made up?—It was made up on three years' purchase of 2,000 *l.* a year. Nobody passing the man's residence and the fish-curing place would have given him credit for having a trade producing more than about 300 *l.* a year, but the man produced his books. He produced his buying of salmon; he produced his buyings of cod, and all the other fish, and he showed how he boiled these fish, and then served them cold to the Master of the Rolls, to the Solicitor General, to Baron Rothschild, to Sir Moses Montefiore, and all the chief of the Jewish people who had them regularly for breakfast, and he showed a profit of over 2,000 *l.* a year, which we could not refute or get rid of, or else we should not have settled his claim; but I found I could not get out of it.

585. You found he was making 2,000 *l.* a year profit?—Yes.

586. Did you give him three years' purchase?—No, he only got 3,600 *l.* altogether. He claimed three years' purchase, or 6,241 *l.*, but he got about a year and a half; he got paid for his leasehold interest and his fixtures, and fish-preserving place for the curing of these things, and then he boiled them, dealing with them as cold fish afterwards.

587. I wish only to know how it was made up?—It was one of the most astonishing cases that ever came beneath my notice, and it was clearly defined. I may mention one thing to show he was a man of some substance. He gave a wedding breakfast to his daughter, and that wedding breakfast cost 600 *l.*

588. Did you ask him to produce his income-tax receipts?—I sometimes ask, but I sometimes do not obtain, but I have in the majority of instances afforded such information to Her Majesty's Government as to the nature of these claims, and the nature of these assertions of profit that in the Kensington improvement I trebled the whole of the amount of income tax received by the Inland Revenue, and in one instance in the City I took a revenue of 6,000 *l.* a year, which had been returned up to 40,000 *l.*,

Mr. *William Holms*—continued.

on which they paid a full tax, and also had to pay back payments for three years.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

589. I think you mentioned some property in Lincoln court which you valued at 500 *l.*, and for which I think you said 3,700 *l.* was given?—£. 3,500. The gross income was 1,000 *l.* a year, The head rent at which it was held was 300 *l.* a year, which was subject to putting the premises into thorough order, at some time during his lease, and expending 2,000 *l.* on it, but he never had laid out 50 *l.* on it.

590. How long was the lease?—Eighteen and a half years; an original 21 years' lease.

591. Was the award in that case given by the arbitrator or by a jury?—Given by the arbitrator.

592. Was that a case in which the land would have been more valuable as an isolated piece of land if it had been sold than it would have been surrounded by bad houses?—It was a narrow court four to five feet wide, with houses built on both sides of it and having no proper ventilation. The houses by their construction originally were fit for habitation, but by their use they were unfitted for habitation, because they were in a high state of beastliness. They were inhabited by the lowest class of the population that hang about Covent Garden Market; they had lately been the scene of a murder, and the moment we got possession so strongly did the water company think of it, that they cut the water off.

593. How much was given for the land in that case?—The land is a different thing altogether. This was let for 300 *l.* a year, and the land would undoubtedly have fetched something like 6,000 *l.*

594. Could the land have been used supposing it had been cleared of those buildings, but remaining surrounded by the other buildings?—That land could have been used because it had a frontage to Great Wild-street, and could have been used as a printer's workshop or tobacco factory; there is a large tobacco factory in Great Wild-street, or for any other commercial purposes, and for a commercial purpose it would have commanded the rent it commanded letting it out in those tenements, 300 *l.* a year, but plus this 300 *l.* a year there was this derivative income of 700 *l.* produced by the vilest set of lettings and of the most horrible tenements; so horrible that the moment the Board came into possession we were fearful of an outbreak of fever, and we got the consent of the Home Secretary to pull them down, and we pulled them down at once.

595. You spoke of isolated plots of land in the middle of one of these schemes; do you know if those are taken at the value which they would command supposing the whole space were cleared, or are they taken at the value they would command, supposing the rest of the houses were surrounding and remained as they were?—They are taken in this way. I will take the Whitecross-street scheme, for instance. Here are three houses lying westward of Messrs. De la Rue's factory, but at some distance, so that

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

Messrs. De la Rue would be a long time before they incorporated them for extension of their factory; they are giving a very large price per foot. Isolated as those three houses are, they would not let, perhaps, for more than 6 *d.* per foot to rebuild, but Messrs. De la Rue have been in the habit of giving 1 *s.* 6 *d.* and 2 *s.* for the acquisition of such properties as are immediately contiguous to theirs; and therefore that would be cited as the value of this which would affect the area of this isolated piece.

596. That would be the price which the Board would have to ultimately pay?—Yes, and which in some instances they were compelled by the evidence to pay, although much against our wishes and feelings.

597. Have there been any other cases of an opposite kind that you know of, where the Board has had to pay merely the price which these isolated plots would command?—I am afraid they did in Whitecross-street to a great extent. I do not think they did in every place, because our operations were not so great as they were there.

598. A suggestion has been made that the Metropolitan Board should take down one part of an area they intend to clear and rebuild houses upon it, and then offer the houses to those about to be turned out from the rest. Do you think that suggestion is practicable?—I will give you an instance. The Peabody Trustees erected buildings on the east side of the railway. We gave them a list of everybody who was dispossessed, and gave also a list of those that were remaining on the west side. Application was made to those individuals to know whether they would accept lodging-house accommodation in the buildings provided for them. Eleven of them went in. Of those eleven one remains at the present moment, and there is only one individual that was turned out of the area that the Peabody Buildings now occupy who remains a tenant of those buildings.

598* I wanted to know whether it would be practicable for the Metropolitan Board of Works to do this itself, to take building operations upon itself?—I have given evidence to the Committee before, urging that the Board should have the power if they chose to exercise it, but I do not know whether I am discreet in mentioning that before my Chairman, whether he would confirm what I say. We have quite enough work to do, but I think that would be getting rid of some of the difficulties.

599. Supposing you had that power, it would not be of very much use exercising it, as far as getting these people, who are turned out of their houses, to come into new houses?—The moment the Board cleared a bit of land, or rather before it cleared it, it would have all its plans submitted to the Home Secretary and confirmed, and would at once put building into operation, and the building being erected, there would be the opportunity of persons being accommodated if they thought fit; but the great difficulty in all these cases is, that the habits of all these people who are dispossessed under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, or under the ordinary improvements where artizans' schemes are provided, are so totally different;

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

different; if you go to Great Wild-street you will see a nice set of curtains before the ground floor widows; you will see a nice window up-stairs, and it is, in fact, for the benefit of a class of artizans that I am sure the Legislature never contemplated benefiting at all; you meant to house those who were at the mercy of their landlords, and could not house themselves; instead of that, the erection of these buildings has given accommodation to a very first-class set of people as far as outside appearance is concerned; take a place that I went to with our Chairman, which has been alluded to, Fryingpan-alley, and Rose-alley, little streets only four foot across; when I said to the people, "We shall provide for you," they said, "Lord, bless you, sir, they would not take people like us in; there is a fellow up-stairs keeps his greens under the bed, and his moke in the cellar; those places are not for me." The woman I was speaking to was connected with making walking sticks, out of a very peculiar article; they would not take her in nor would they take her husband, who is a sweep; that is the class of people we turn out.

600. Do you think it would be practical for the Metropolitan Board of Works to build model lodging-houses?—I think it would, and I think it should be in the power of the Board, as Sir Henry Hunt has observed in his evidence, to accommodate a different class, and give a different class of building to the requirements of these people who are a little too luxuriously accommodated in either the Peabody or the improved industrial dwellings.

601. Do you think the Metropolitan Board of Works could build these lodging-houses so as to pay, or would they end in a loss?—In the first scheme we made a series of elevations; we made a series of plans, and we made a series of calculations, and we found we could, by taking the same rental as was taken by the various companies whose evidence we had before us, build and make a profit, which they were quite justified in, of from four to five per cent.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

602. Is that taking into account the value of the land?—Yes, debiting the concern with the same value as we accepted from other people.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

603. You are now speaking of that lower class of house for the lower classes of people?—Yes.

604. And you think you could make a profit?—I think we could.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

605. You would still have the original loss on the land?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *Rankin.*

606. Might I ask you what are the general considerations that guide you in taking the value of the land in cases where you say nothing but the materials and the value of the land ought to be awarded?—I take what that land would be worth as ground rent for houses proposed to be put on it, for the re-building. For instance, take a house of 30 *l.* a-year. The ground rent applicable to that house would be 5 *l.* per annum, and the 5 *l.* per annum capitalised in present money is 100 *l.*

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

607. Do you compare the value of that particular land with the other land in the neighbourhood?—Quite so.

608. You mentioned having had to build some houses a storey higher than ordinary; what do you consider a proper height for houses of that description?—We never like to go beyond five storeys if we can help it. Six storeys we consider the very maximum, the very greatest height we ought to attain, and then only when the width of the street will enable the lower storey to get sufficient light and air, because the higher you take the house the greater the amount of shadow.

609. Do you prefer narrow streets and low buildings or high buildings and wide streets?—That all depends upon circumstances. That depends upon the position of the place, I should say; I would have, ordinarily speaking, dwarf buildings and narrow streets than high buildings and widened streets, sanitarily I am speaking now.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

610. You were saying that you think a superior class of tenants come in to the model dwellings which are erected to what were contemplated under the Act?—I am afraid so by looking outside, by the adornment of the windows, and by the style of the luxury of the inhabitants, if I may say so, or the comfort of the inhabitants inside.

611. Is it not the case that most of those dwellings have certain rules and regulations under which they do not accept tenants who are receiving more than a certain amount of wages per week?—I understood that the Peabody Buildings did not accept anybody who had more than a guinea to 22 *s.* a week, but I am afraid from what I can see that they are not very particular in their inquiry. The man who has 22 *s.* a week would never have crimson cloth curtains to the front of his windows, at least I do not apprehend he would.

612. Is it not the case that the inhabitants of those dwellings, though they may come in on very small wages a week, rapidly improve their position and become more respectable and more prosperous in every way?—There is no doubt that these dwellings are incident to the moral, social, and intellectual advancement of the people generally. I am quite confident of it.

613. You do not think that the people who are displaced from the condemned areas, as a rule, return to the same district when the new buildings are put up?—No. I looked at one of the cases where we tabulated the whole of the population that we removed. In the Sun-street, the Worship-street improvement, under the Streets Improvement Act, we removed a great number. There the obligation as to housing them was not placed on us by the Legislature, but it was the customary thing done in all Bills. We then made a list of every occupant, and I sent round a man to them to say, you shall find your own place of removal; here is a sovereign to enable you to meet the first expenses of inquiry,

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

quiry, and so that you shall not be put to any extra expense by so doing. When you have found where you say you would like to locate then give us notice; we will send round to see that it is a proper place for you, and then we will help you with another 4 *l.*, making 5 *l.* to each of you, and we will take you before a magistrate to affirm and get your evidence that you are properly housed; and in that case we housed the whole of them, and I find they went to all manner of places. They went to Stratford, on the east.

614. What site are you talking of?—I am talking of a site close to Bishopsgate-street, Sun-street to Worship-street, nearly opposite the old station of the Great Eastern Railway, and I am reminding you how we dealt with these, and where they went to. They went to Walworth, Stratford, Chelsea, and in fact diffused themselves all over the outskirts of the metropolis, and I had a return, which I thought I had brought with me, showing that.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

615. You will be able to bring it next time?—Yes.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

616. At our last meeting a report was put in by the Engineer of the Board on the facilities of access which these people then displaced had to the place where their work chiefly lay. From that report I should think that the Board considered that the means of access were not sufficient?—Well, we consider that all railways should afford the same facilities as the Great Eastern Railway does: that they should all run workmen's trains at a low cost. It is only the Great Eastern that affords the privilege of the penny trains.

617. It is only the Great Eastern Railway Company who supply trains at an early enough hour for the wants of the working classes?—That is so.

618. And it is only the Great Eastern Railway who charge them fares at a reasonable rate?—A penny per journey.

Mr. *Bryce.*

619. You spoke just now of these people who were turned out from the neighbourhood of Sun-street. I suppose you do not remember what class those people belonged to, do you. Whether they were what we call artizans in the sense of being skilled mechanics, such as engineers; or whether they were a lower class?—Some of them were, and some were what you may call labourers.

620. It would not be the case with skilled workmen that they would scatter themselves to a great distance; they would be obliged to keep within a certain distance. For instance, if a skilled workman was engaged in a factory near Bishopsgate he would not settle at Chelsea?—They would look to the facility of the communication by railway. They would like to settle in the country if they could. I think Mr. Gatcliffe gave some strong evidence of the desire of many of his people to live a long way off.

621. But only in a place in the country where

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

it was served by a railway that brought them close to their work?—Yes.

622. They would not scatter promiscuously in other parts of the metropolis?—Not unless they had facilities of access.

623. Would it not be the case with regard to this area, that they would be people who could take up their living in one part as well as in another, and rather below the class of skilled artizans?—No; I think a great many were skilled artizans connected with the carpenters' and builders' shops close by there.

624. Did you trace what became of that class?—I can hardly tell you now.

625. Have you any statistics?—I have it all, and can put it in, showing exactly what happened.

626. I think it will be worth while to put that in. You mention that the poorer class of people who were turned out did not get into the Peabody Buildings. Do you suggest that to be owing to the rules that the trustees impose, or to the fact that the rent is too high?—No; I think it is the antagonism that the lower classes have to habits of cleanliness.

627. That is to a certain extent the rule, is not it?—They see the rules; they have to be in at a certain time; the gas is turned out at a certain time. They are not allowed to cover their walls with all the fancy literature of the day which the poorer classes do, and they are not allowed the comfort and luxury of dwelling in dirt. I may say that in my practice I have had a good many houses to take charge of for the Board, and I have extended the Board's kindness towards people, and have put them in to take care of the houses. I have put a woman and her children in, and said, "Here is a capital house for you; you can use a couple of these rooms, and keep the others closed up till the house is pulled down, and I have then found them, when I have gone over the house, all huddled in one room, doing all the offices of nature in one place. Then I have said, "Why on earth did not you have cleanliness and comfort; this place is stinking." Then the answer is, "We like the warmth, sir."

628. Is it not the case, notwithstanding that there are a considerable number of the very poor people who, nevertheless, do wish to live in cleanliness and decency?—I hope it is the case.

629. Has it not been the case in your experience?—No, it has not been the case in my experience, but rather to the contrary.

630. Your experience does not agree with that of a great many others who have looked into the matter?—I said, my experience with regard to the desire of the poor for places of cleanliness has been rather different to what the honourable Member suggested. He thought, or seemed to suggest, that the evidence was in favour of their being desirous to be clean.

631. A good many of them?—Now, I have been in pretty well every slum of the metropolis, and I have had as much to do as any man existing with the lower classes of the people, and I must confess that the lower the grade I get into the greater the amount of dirt, and misery, and squalor, and the greater the amount of vice, and along with that dirt and squalor, the greater the amount of drunkenness.

632. Then

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

632. Then I take it you agree with me that it is not that the rent of the Peabody dwellings is at all prohibitory?—No, decidedly not.

633. It is the existence of these rules enforcing a certain kind of cleanliness and order?—It is.

634. What is your objection to giving higher than six storeys; is it that you think it is too high for them to walk, or do you think it makes the street below too dark?—It excludes the light and air from the storeys below.

635. Has the plan of lifts been tried in these high houses?—I do not think passenger lifts have been tried.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

636. Are you of opinion that there are numbers of cases that might be dealt with by the vestries without putting the Metropolitan Board of Works to some great scheme?—If the vestries had carried out in a proper spirit the duties imposed on them, no doubt many of these things might be remedied, and the Board not called in.

637. You suggested just now that the medical officers were not sufficiently free from the opinion of the vestries to take matters up to the extreme of their duties?—I know this that an officer has great difficulty in performing his duty where so many people who employ him may be either directly or indirectly connected with the operations he is about to enforce; I know it is so in my own parish, and therefore I presume it may be so in others too.

638. You think that if Mr. Torrens' Act be put in force, and houses had been closed, a good deal might have been done?—I think a great deal more might have been done than has been done up to the present moment.

639. With regard to leases, you made a suggestion that leases or agreements made after the Provisional Order was announced should not be recognised as entitled to compensation. Would that, do you think, very much decrease the arbitrator's duties?—I think it would prevent a great number of frauds that are practised. I will give you an instance. I am called in to value a house. I find an agreement existing for that house at 80 *l.* a year; my practical knowledge tells me it is not worth more than 60 *l.* I find all the surrounding houses let at the same rent, but I have stuck in my face a lease granted at 80 *l.* a year. What am I to do; am I to indict all those people for fraud, or recommend that they should be indicted for conspiracy.

640. Then in fact you regard a good many of these as bogus leases?—I endeavour to treat them as bogus, and I only value on the basis of what I think the value ought to be, but sometimes I find our judgment cannot be supported when the evidence comes into court, and the man distinctly swears he has given that, and that agreement is a legal transaction between him and his tenant.

Mr. *Cropper.*

641. I suppose, from what you have said, and I confess from what I saw on going round, I quite agree with you, there is no practical reason why the greater part of the very poorest residents in those streets should be there more than in any other place?—No.

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

642. You are not bound to find houses for them in the most expensive part of the metropolis?—I think it would be a suicidal policy to do that; you would destroy the value of immense property for the accommodation of parties who could get residences or dwelling-places elsewhere equally beneficial.

643. And you would say that the people really wanted there are the sort whom these Peabody and other industrial dwellings do accommodate?—Yes.

644. And that the costermonger, or the maker of walking-sticks, and all people engaged in those small trades, might just as well dwell where houses are cheaper?—Quite so. I went into a house in Newport Market, one of those represented by the Honourable Miss Stanley; I found three children huddled together in a room, and I said, "Where is your mother?" "She is out, sir." "Where is your father?" "Father is in trouble, sir." "Trouble, what is the matter?" "He is wrongfully having three months, sir." That is about the style here and there you find; and when I tell you that the man whom we put in the public-house, "The Grapes," is obliged to lock up his till and padlock his door, because at any given moment an inroad might be made into that which applies to himself; I can tell you the class of people that are turned out, and on behalf of whom so much sympathy has been expressed, from this Newport Market site.

645. Then I suppose that the removal of whole hordes of these people would really be no great loss to them; they only drifted into the places because they found them cheap?—We have just got the buildings down in Westminster completed by the Peabody Trustees, and we have given notice that there are 600 places of accommodation. We have given notice to all these people here that there is accommodation provided for you if you like to take it; and you cannot say that from the centre of Soho down to Westminster is an impracticable distance for these people to come.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

646. I think that the Trustees of the Peabody Buildings have sent notice up saying they are willing to accept them, and will be glad to get their addresses?—Yes; they have given notice to that effect.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

647. Have any come or accepted?—I do not know at this moment. The notice was only given last week.

Mr. *Cropper.*

648. It is really rather an advantage to these people to break up their associations and style of living, which is always making bad worse, and rather fostering their dirty habits?—Quite so.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

649. I gather from your evidence that you would approve of the suggestion of Mr. Rodwell in answer to Question 493, that after a scheme had been approved of by the Government, and

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

before the Provisional Order, and after the local inquiry, no person should claim compensation for any alteration in the terms of the tenancy?—Certainly.

650. Or for any improvement made in the property unless by compulsion or for sanitary purposes?—Certainly.

651. That is a suggestion you concur in, and an alteration you would like to see made?—Yes.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

652. I gather from these figures you have put in that the loss to the Metropolitan Board of Works, on the schemes where the land has been sold, amounts to two-thirds of the total cost of the land?—Yes.

653. May we take that as on the whole a fair average of what is likely to be the case?—I think you may.

654. On the other hand, if you were permitted to sell the land free from obligations, you would take 15 per cent. off, and then you would recover 85 per cent. of your outlay. Therefore there is the difference between 85 per cent. and 33 per cent., the loss you now sustain?—Yes. The general average of the loss upon street improvements; that is, the difference between the amount paid and the amount ultimately received for the whole of the ground rents is a loss of 75 per cent.

655. That is to say, by street improvements. I only mean under these schemes?—Take Queen Victoria-street, or take the Clerkenwell Improvement, any scheme in which we widen the streets and relet the land, the loss to the ratepayers is about 75 per cent.

656. But taking these schemes under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, if you were allowed to sell the land commercially you would only lose 15 per cent.?—That is very likely.

657. Then I also infer from your evidence that in your opinion the class dispossessed by these schemes is not the class of people who come in again afterwards and occupy the improved dwellings?—I think in the case of Goulston-street and Middlesex-street, where there was a colony of Jews disturbed, and where we intend to put commercial buildings up on a part of it, which we are not obliged to devote to artizans; there is a part which we had to take. I think there the colony will come back, because they are allied with their neighbours on the opposite side of the road; but, generally speaking, under ordinary circumstances, the parties do not come back.

658. Then as regards the working classes, the artizans and other people working at a distance, they are no worse off than they were before, even supposing this land were applied for commercial uses?—No; and if they were dealt with as I have shown we dealt with them in Sun-street and Worship-street, they would be enabled in the outskirts of the metropolis and other places to provide themselves with better accommodation than they formerly had, and put a few pounds in their pockets.

659. It has been suggested by Sir Henry Hunt that, with a view of limiting proceedings under this Act, the parties should have the option at an early stage of going to a jury or before the

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

arbitrator, and that the appeal from the arbitrator to the jury should be done away with. Have you formed any opinion upon that?—Yes; it is a double expense. They first have the right of appeal to the arbitrator, and if they are not satisfied with that, if it is anything over 500 *l.* they can go to a jury. Well, although the evidence I have put in shows that in our appeals from the arbitrator to a jury, we were successful in reducing the amount awarded; I think, looking at the case altogether from an economic point of view, I should, having appointed an official arbitrator, make the appeal to him final.

660. Would you also be prepared to adopt the other suggestion, namely, that the parties should have the option at an early stage, of going to a jury or to an arbitrator?—No; I would make the arbitrator singly and alone the final judge.

661. That was not Sir Henry Hunt's proposal?—I think his modesty did not allow him to suggest that.

662. He suggested there should be the option of going either to arbitration or to a jury in the first instance. What would be the effect, in your opinion, upon the result of the costs of these operations if all the parties, down to the lowest class of persons, except perhaps weekly tenants, were permitted to go to a jury in the first instance?—It is just the same as under the Lands Clauses Act. Every leasehold interest is entitled to claim a jury if he does not arrange with the buyer; every freehold interest in the same way. But my idea with regard to an arbitrator is an arbitrator of such eminence as Sir Henry Hunt, or any other gentleman equal to him in his profession, who is acquainted with the value of property, who can judge for himself, and who is sufficiently strong to rely on his own judgment, and to fear nothing that might be said as to how his award is made. To such a man as that the appeal might be brought, and the appeal on the other hand is a comparatively small amount of expense; but when you take a jury, when you take 12 men haphazard selected out of society here, there, and everywhere; men whose judgment and honesty we cannot say a word upon, but who may be led away by the forensic eloquence of some honourable member of the Bar, or by the authoritative swearing of some honourable member of my own profession, it is a toss up as to which way the jury will go.

663. But I presume Sir Henry Hunt would say that, if you take away the appeal from the arbitrator to the jury, you ought to give to the party at an earlier stage the option of going either to a jury or an arbitrator?—Certainly.

664. What would be the effect on the cost of this operation of there being the alternative at an early stage; would it not increase the cost of the proceedings?—I think not. The provisional award is always made when we cannot agree with the claimant, and the claimant instead of having the provisional award made for him would say, I will go at once to the arbitrator or go at once to the jury. I suggest an arbitrator alone; but that is a matter of discretion and consideration.

665. In

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

665. In your experience do you find that the proceedings before juries are more expensive than the proceedings before arbitrators?—Decidedly.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

666. What do you say to raising the appealable value from 500 *l.* to 1,000 *l.*, so that there should not be an appeal, except where the amount in dispute is about 1,000 *l.*?—As I have said, I think the cheapest and most reasonable and most satisfactory mode is where the arbitrator is sole judge. If you increase his power from 500 *l.* to 1,000 *l.*, you advance along the step I have mentioned.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

667. I presume if the restrictions on the sale of these properties were done away with that many more schemes would be undertaken by the Metropolitan Board of Works?—Yes.

668. It would remove one of the difficulties they have in the direction of getting at those schemes?—Yes.

Monday, 13*th March* 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Viscount Emlyn.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.

The Right Honourable Sir RICHARD CROSS, in the Chair.

Mr. Frederick William Goddard, re-called; and further Examined.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

669. I think you wish to explain some of the answers which you gave on the last occasion?—There are one or two matters which, with your permission, I will correct in my evidence. I stated that there were 500 abstracts brought into our office in a week.

670. You wish to explain the statement that the net loss on the purchase of the sites under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, and the resale of the area for building, would not exceed 15 per cent.?—I say in answer to Question No. 583, that in one week there were some 500 abstracts thrown into our Board. I find that we complete upon an average in every year 500 purchases, besides all the leases, loans, agreements, and all matters connected with the conveyancing department. There were never so many as 500 abstracts put in in a week.

Chairman.

671. What is the next point to which you wish to refer?—The next is with regard to Question 654, as to the loss sustained by the Board upon the acquisition of the various sites, and as to the loss that they would have provided that they could devote all the areas in those schemes to commercial purposes, rather than to artizans' dwellings purposes. Offhand I answered 15 per cent.; I had in my eye and in my recollection then the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme, and that does work out at 15 per cent.; but some of the others work out very considerably more; for instance, the Bedfordbury scheme works out at 62 per cent.

672. Is that the loss?—The loss would be 62 per cent. upon the acquisition. The Goulston-street scheme works out at 58½; the St. George-the-Martyr scheme works out at 57 per cent.; the Great Wild-street scheme works out at 48 per cent.; the Whitecross-street scheme works out at 48 per cent.; the Old Pye-street scheme works out at 43½ per cent.; the High-street, Islington, scheme works out at 52 per cent.; the Pear Tree-court scheme works out at 35 per cent.; the Essex-road scheme works out at 63 per cent.; and the Boyman's Buildings scheme

Chairman—continued.

works out at 44 per cent.; making an average over the whole of 50 per cent.; and that is contrasted with the loss of what we sustained under the Streets Improvements, which was 75 per cent.

673. Is that all that you wish to explain?—Yes, as to that.

674. I want to ask you a question upon that, for I did not understand the answer you gave to the Right honourable Gentleman the Member for Reading, at No. 654; do you mean, if you take an ordinary street improvement, such as the large one that you contemplate from Charing Cross to Holborn, that the ordinary loss upon that would be 75 per cent.?—That is our experience. We get one-fourth back out of the expenditure that we make.

675. Then in none of the schemes under the Artizans' Act have you gone to such a great loss?—We have had a higher loss than that in relation to artizans' dwellings alone; there it was about 82 per cent.

676. Would about 82 per cent. be the average of the whole of the schemes?—That would be about the average of the whole of the schemes.

677. Then we may take it in this way, at all events, that the loss on the whole of the artizans' schemes using the places for artizans' buildings, would, as compared with the loss of an ordinary great street improvement, be about 7 per cent. more than the street improvement?—That is so.

678. Not more than that?—Not more than that.

679. That is for artizans' purposes?—For artizans' purposes; the commercial purposes I have given you in this list which I handed in.

680. Under the strict provisions of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act the loss on the average is only 7 per cent. more than that of an ordinary large street improvement?—It is so.

681. Now I want you to be good enough to look at the Act of 1879; have you any suggestion to make on the 3rd section which you think would be just to owners of property, and still further

Chairman—continued.

further cut down the amount of compensation which the arbitrator would be bound to give them?—Evidence of the cost of the restoration of those buildings or premises affected has been given before the arbitrator, and it has also been specifically stated by our counsel and witnesses before any juries who have taken into consideration these very provisions of this Act; but I am very much afraid that they have never given the due weight that such a section in the Act should be entitled to receive. I do not know whether any language can make it more forcible. If, perhaps, you could make it imperative that in the award of the arbitrator or in the verdict of the jury, the jury or the arbitrator respectively shall state that the amount of their verdict or award is so much, taking into consideration so much for the cost of repairing the premises, so that it would be absolutely upon the face of the award or verdict, that might be a useful amendment.

682. Your complaint of Section No. 3 is as to the way in which it has been worked, and not as to the principle of it?—No, the principle of it is perfectly right.

683. Do you think that the principle contained in Section 3, if properly awarded and properly carried out, is as far as you can reasonably go in an Act of Parliament of this kind?—Yes. As to these words, "a nuisance as aforesaid," we have had the evidence of the inspectors of nuisances, who say that perhaps for a 5*l.* note or for 10*l.*, the nuisance which the house is condemned for can be avoided; but when we send our own practical men who are accustomed to carry out work, and to estimate the real cost of putting that house in a habitable condition, the amount comes to ten times, very likely, or to five times the amount which the man employed by the parish considers would avoid the whole thing.

684. Is it too much to ask you whether you could favour us at a future period with an amended clause such as would carry out your views?—I will do my best to do so.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

685. I suppose that before an arbitrator or a jury you would bring counter evidence to meet the evidence of the local officers?—We always put in a detailed schedule of every item of repair that is required to put the premises into a habitable state, to answer what I term the customary covenants and conditions of the lease granted by the landlord; and we consider that that gives a basis upon which the amount to be assessed should be arrived at. Instead of this these men go in for a mere question of whitewashing and superficial alteration of premises.

686. Still the arbitrators, or the jury, have before them your statement and your calculation?—Undoubtedly, and it is pressed upon them.

687. And, therefore, we must assume that they take it into consideration?—I presume they do.

688. You would like it to be made certain by making them state the amount which they allow for the abatement of the nuisance on their award?—Yes.

Chairman.

689. Will you turn to the 4th section of the Act of 1879, which is as follows: "Whereas, by the 5th section of the Principal Act it is provided, amongst other things, that an improvement scheme of a local authority shall provide for the accommodation of at least as many persons of the working classes as may be displaced in the area with respect to which the scheme is proposed in suitable dwellings, which, unless there are special reasons to the contrary, shall be situate within the limits of the same area, or in the vicinity thereof: And whereas it not unfrequently happens that having due regard to the requirements of persons of the working classes displaced by an improvement scheme, equally convenient accommodation at a much less cost can be furnished to such persons, or some of them, at some place other than within the area or the immediate vicinity of the area from which they have been displaced. Be it enacted that, where it is proved to the satisfaction of the confirming authority on an application to authorize or modify an improvement scheme that equally convenient accommodation can be provided for any persons of the working class displaced by an improvement scheme at some place other than within the area, or the immediate vicinity of the area, comprised in the improvement scheme, and it is also proved to the satisfaction of such authority that the required accommodation has been or is about to be forthwith provided, it shall be lawful," and so on. Do you read those words as ordaining that it is necessary that there should be fresh accommodation provided by the promoters of the schemes, or that you might take into consideration that which independent builders had done in the neighbourhood?—I should read it thus: that accommodation should be provided by the promoters of the scheme.

690. And you do not think that it would give the power to the Secretary of State to take into consideration any other accommodation which had been provided *aliunde*?—I apprehend that if the Board could show that there was a large accommodation round any particular site which it had to deal with, and greater accommodation than the necessity of that site removal would provide for, that then the Home Secretary might consider this in the light of relaxation to us; but irrespective of that we should not consider it so. Our way of dealing with it would be by the local authority; but it might be within the purview of the Home Secretary to relax the obligation if we showed that additional accommodation was provided in that district.

691. *Aliunde*?—Yes.

692. If there was any difficulty about the construction of the Act you would think that there should be a wise amendment to make that point clear?—Certainly.

693. Now about the 4th section, have you ever made an application to the Secretary of State under that section on behalf of the Board?—We have in the Street Improvements.

694. But not under the 1875 Act. We had it in evidence from Mr. Richardson last year that no application had been made?—I think not under

Chairman—continued.

under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act pure and simple.

695. Can you tell me why that is?—We considered that that Act applied to the immediate district, and we should not have been any wiser or better off, as I explained the other day, if we had attempted to obtain sites within a reasonable distance, because we should have to dispossess the individuals; and, to use the simile that I used before, we should have to dig two holes for one.

696. Have the Board any power, under any of these Acts of Parliament, to build?—No, none.

697. You meant to say that, if you at present were to use the ratepayers' money for the purpose of erecting any building it would be *ultra vires*?—Quite so. I may just qualify what I said the other day with reference to the advisability of building. I say it in the presence of my chairman, I was very doubtful what course our Board would take upon that. Of course, I do not express any view of the Board as a board, only express, as an officer, my own opinion.

698. I will ask you a few questions, quite independently of the Board; You have had, I believe, considerable experience in the poor parts of London, quite irrespective of your connection with the Board?—Yes.

699. Do you think that it would be wise to build any of those large barracks which have been spoken of for the accommodation of the very poor class?—That is a question that I can hardly answer you. It is a question almost of political economy.

700. Do you think that they could be built so as to pay?—We made a very careful calculation in the year 1875, when the Act was first promulgated, and we took our cubical contents at about 5½, and we found, as I said last Thursday, that it would yield a profit of from 4 to 5 per cent., that is debiting the land with from 3 *d.* to 4 *d.* a foot, as the case may be.

701. That would be a loss on the land, would it not?—That we should have to bear in either case.

702. So that in one of these cleared streets on which you have borne a loss, it would probably answer your purpose better to build some of these places than to let the land?—I do not want to advise putting ourselves in competition with any of the societies or building arrangements that have been made for the accommodation of these classes; and my desire, or rather my wish, as far as the building of the Board was concerned was, that there should be no delay in covering that important site, Newport Market, which will enable the Board to carry on its western improvements at a quicker rate; but if we had no proper tenders for that site then the Board, failing to create proper ground rents upon its own property, and so utilising the land for that purpose, will I apprehend, if you give that permission, be able to cover the site speedily, and thereby expedite that improvement which is now delayed very considerably.

703. And if you confined yourselves to the building of houses for the very poor, you would not come into conflict with any of the other sets

Chairman—continued.

of people who build for rather a better class?—Yes, that is so.

704. I understood you to say that in none of the places you know of, where the Peabody Trustees have built their buildings, have the actual inhabitants, except in very few cases, gone into the new buildings?—I gave evidence with regard to the Whitechapel scheme, that where 11 first went in one now remains, and I believe that very few (I speak only from hearsay) of the original inhabitants of Bedfordbury have gone back there.

705. But the people who have gone into these new buildings have left other houses empty where they were living before?—Yes.

706. And probably it may be that some of the poorer people have gone into the houses that have been so emptied?—It is so, no doubt.

707. So that although the old inhabitants do not go into the new buildings, there may still nevertheless be a general rise in the habitations; they will go into better habitations than they were in before, though not into the new buildings put up upon the site?—Yes, that would be so.

708. The inhabitants of the different areas which have been cleared under this Act by the Board no doubt differ in character very much, do they not; some, for instance, were inhabited by the Jews?—Yes.

709. And some, we have had in evidence, were simply resorts of thieves and prostitutes?—Yes.

710. But no one would wish that the thieves and prostitutes should be huddled together again in the same place, whatever the houses were that were built; in that you agree?—Quite so.

711. And one of the great advantages of clearing out those sites is, that it is found, as a matter of fact, that these people, being once displaced, do not congregate together again, at all events, for some time?—I apprehend that if they are displaced they are drawn together again by that mutual attraction which takes place with people of that peculiar character.

712. They cannot all get together?—No.

713. Would it be a wise provision to leave it to the confirming authorities, subject to the Secretary of State, to inquire, by local inquiry or through an arbitrator, how far it is necessary in each particular case to provide for the accommodation of the people who have been displaced?—Yes.

714. Not to make it an actual imperative rule, but to leave each case to be decided as it comes up?—Yes.

715. For instance, if we were to take a case where there were a considerable number of costermongers together, it is necessary for that particular trade that they should be tolerably near to one of the markets where they get their supplies, and it would be very hard to send those people out into the country?—Yes.

716. And the same with other trades; the same with the dock labourers, where they can live close to their labour; and the same where the earnings do not depend solely upon those of the head of the family, but where, in the immediate locality, the other members of the family are enabled to get daily work?—Yes, those are matters

Chairman—continued.

matters which are entitled to very great consideration.

717. Therefore you would not disapprove of the plan which would leave it to be decided according to each case by the conforming authority, subject to the Secretary of State, after due inquiry?—Yes, the honourable Member for Andover asked me some questions with reference to the dispossession and dispersion of the inhabitants of the Sun-street and Worship-street improvement; I have had a statement made which I will put in evidence, but I must correct one part of it. I said they went to Walworth, to Stratford, and to Chelsea; they go to Walworth and to Stratford I find, but to Chelsea they have not gone.

718. Can you tell me in round numbers the population that has been or will be displaced by all the schemes?—There are 22,000 disturbed and taken away on the present schemes for which accommodation is provided, and 2,209 extra accommodations over and beyond.

719. That is to say, accommodation provided in the schemes; it is not actually built?—Provided in the schemes.

720. You would not say for a moment that it would be wise or politic to pull down the houses of 22,000 people without making some provision for some of the inhabitants somewhere?—No, they are taken down in sections.

721. You would not suggest that in any Act of Parliament that obligation should be done away with?—No, that should certainly be under the discretion of the Home Secretary for the time being.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

722. Upon what principle have you made this estimate of the per-centages of the different improvements?—Twenty years' purchase on the annual rental in commercial value.

723. Take the Whitecross-street case: I see you bought that at 1*l.* 2*s.* 10*d.* per foot, and land reserved for trade purposes 1*l.* 5*s.*; had the rest of the land been reserved at an equal value you would have had no loss?—Yes, but I was obliged to take this in all the schemes. We are a certain number of years before we can cover the land; I cannot assume that anybody would take the entire commercial area at once, therefore I discount it, and allow one year's peppercorn, and so on.

724. How much do you allow?—I take the area at 1*s.* instead of 1*s.* 3*d.*, and cover it at 20 years' purchase.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

725. If you sold the property ultimately at 1*l.* 5*s.* there would have been no loss; there would have been a gain?—But first you have to deduct all the lands to make the alleys; you have not the entire area to deal with.

Chairman.

726. That is one of the great sources of loss?—Yes, the loss upon the whole scheme is 130,000*l.*, and I take exception to Mr. Vigers' statement in the former evidence in the Blue Book.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

727. That is at Question 3679?—Yes. I look upon it in this light: if you have a building scheme you must provide all necessary approaches and adjuncts, and that is a part of the debit, of the loss. He cannot put one to one set of things and one to another; he has ascribed what he calls "local improvement," that is the widening of streets to one set; but all we know is that the exchequer of the Board has a representation of so much acquisition, so much receipt, so much loss; and you may manipulate and call it what you please, but there is a loss upon each separate scheme. We may say also that in local improvements the Board never contribute more than half, the other half being borne by the vestry or parish in which the local improvement is situated.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

728. Is the loss in this case merely that which is used for street improvements?—The loss is the loss in making the street approaches, in making the side adjuncts to give the building light. This reduces the area that you ultimately have left, after making your first purchase; you must make all the approaches; you must give your adjuncts for light and air; and all those when deducted give the total available area.

729. The area that remains you could probably sell at as good a price as you bought it at?—Yes. You can never get your land covered at once, and the larger the area the greater the time and trouble. The average of the Board's covering is about four years; therefore 20 years' purchase for the disturbance, and four years, would be something like 17 years' purchase on the rental. You have to look at it in all ways.

Mr. JOHN GRANT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

730. WHAT are you?—Assistant engineer to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

731. How long have you held that office?—Thirty-three years with them and their predecessors, the former Commissioners of Sewers.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

732. Have you had occasion to give your attention to such matters as are now being investigated by this Committee?—I have.

733. Did you attend at Glasgow by the direc-

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

tion of the Board to inquire into the circumstances under which labourers' dwellings have been largely erected in that city?—I did, in March 1877.

734. Will you now state to the Committee the result of the investigations that you have made?—I will put in a copy of the Report which I made.

735. Is there anything in this Report that you would like shortly to bring before the Committee?—The pith of that Report is to this effect: that I found

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

I found in none of the Glasgow Improvement or Police Acts was there any clause corresponding in its restrictions to the 33rd section of the Metropolis Streets Improvements Act, 1877.

Chairman.

736. We need not go into that Act?—By the 22nd clause of the Glasgow Improvements Act, 1866, the trustees were empowered to lay out the lands as they might deem best, and sell or dispose of the ground or buildings, or any part of them, or lease or feu the same on such terms and subject to such conditions as they might fix upon, and might erect buildings on them, and generally deal with the lands, houses, and so forth, as absolute proprietors. By the 23rd clause they had power to erect and maintain such dwellings for the working and poorer classes as the trustees might from time to time think expedient. As a matter of fact, with the exception of two tenements or lodging-houses experimentally built at Drygate, the trustees did not build in accordance with that last-mentioned clause, but after six months' notice of ejectment, as per Clauses 28 and 29, and proving to the sheriff of Lanarkshire that other and suitable accommodation existed elsewhere within the city or its neighbourhood, they demolished the buildings and sold the land, or let it by public auction to the highest bidder, the principal conditions being that no dwelling-house should have more than three rooms. The trustees under the same Act bought two estates at the east and west ends of Glasgow, laid out and constructed streets and roads, and sold these estates to builders at a clear profit of 20,000 *l.* The result of these operations was that in the 10½ years which had expired at the time of my visit the trustees had demolished 2,901 dwellings, accommodating 12,969 persons, and covering about 80 acres; they had made or widened more than 50 streets, acquired and formed Alexandra Park, spent altogether 1,801,298 *l.*, including 100,000 *l.* for management and expenses of the Act, of which total they got back 80 per cent. For the remaining 20 per cent., or 360,000 *l.*, they devoted one-fourth of the land to the new streets, got their park, and effected such extensive improvements in the oldest and densest parts of Glasgow, as completely changed the character of the localities. The original Improvements Act of 1866 has been continued by Amendment Acts, first in 1871, and lastly in 1880. In all of these Acts the trustees are left free to sell or lease to the best advantage. They have had no difficulty down to the present time in getting the certificate of the sheriff, that there was sufficient accommodation for the displaced tenants elsewhere, as they were able to show that from seven to eight times the amount of accommodation existed elsewhere. If this rule had been applied to the Metropolitan Board of Works' operations, it would have been possible to show a much larger proportion of accommodation. For instance, when the Census of 1881 was taken, the uninhabited houses in the metropolis were found to be 36,929, and those that were in course of erection at that time were 7,700, or 7½ per cent. and 1½ per cent. respectively of the whole number of houses in the metropolis. Thus the empty

Chairman—continued.

houses contained accommodation for 291,000 persons, and those that were being built for 60,676 persons more, making a total of upwards of 350,000 persons; whereas the whole population displaced by the 14 schemes of the Metropolitan Board of Works Artizans' Dwellings Act was 22,600. By the 23rd section of the Glasgow Improvements Act the trustees were empowered, if they thought proper, to build houses for the working classes, but with the exception of a small experiment that was made, in 1870, of building two lodging-houses, they had not exercised this power, and, down to the present time, they have not thought it advisable to exercise that power, though the question has been brought up a great many times at the meetings of the trustees. The trustees, so far from suffering loss by these operations of theirs, have profited, first, by the two lodging-houses which they built in Drygate-street, in 1870; secondly, by the sale of the ground at Dennistown, at the east end of Glasgow; thirdly, by laying out and selling to builders the estate at Overnewton, at the west end of Glasgow; and fourthly, by the sale of the estate at Oatlands, in the south-east of Glasgow. They have, since 1877, the time of my visit, bought another estate of 5¼ acres in the north-east of Glasgow, which they are proceeding to lay out for building in the same way as they did the two estates at Oatlands and Overnewton. I can produce, for the information of the Committee, the conditions of sale issued at the time of selling or leasing the lands upon those two estates. There is a manuscript clause in it, which is the only one fettering the construction, and it is to the effect that no one dwelling-house should have more than three rooms.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

737. Are their clauses more or less stringent than ours?—There is no stringency at all. There is no stipulation as to rent.

Chairman.

738. There is no reason why you should be under that Act?—No, nor for the dwellings being built or continued for any one class. Having seen the beneficial results of the free and uncontrolled action of the trustees under the Glasgow Improvement Acts, I came back with the decided opinion that if the Metropolitan Board of Works were left free to dispose to the best advantage of the surplus lands bought under their Street Improvement Acts, it would be better for the public, by allowing the improvements to be carried out without delay, and by the economy which would be effected. Furthermore, my opinion was, and is, that no hardship would have been suffered even by the poorest persons displaced by the operations of the Board. Experience, I think, has shown since my visit to Glasgow five years ago that it was utterly impossible, even if it was desirable, to earmark the original tenants and replace them in other houses on or near the cleared sites. It seems therefore to me, and I state my opinion with all deference, to be a waste of public money to prevent improvements of the greatest importance and urgency from being carried out in the vain attempt to effect that which in the nature of things

Chairman—continued.

things is impossible, and would be of no benefit even to the working classes themselves. The land has cost the Board of Works four times as much as it has been possible to get for it under the Artizans' Dwellings Act.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

739. Do you consider that the Metropolitan Board of Works could in London carry into effect the re-housing of the labouring classes as well as was done in that case which you have referred to in Glasgow; if not, what points of difference are there; is there anything fresh that you would like to say beyond what you have already said?—I have a statement here relating exclusively to the Artizans' Dwellings Acts which, if I might be allowed, I would read as containing, in as brief a form as I could put them, my opinions upon the points that you have asked me. With respect to the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, I am of opinion that the principle is unsound which would compel, require, authorise, or even permit a municipal authority at the public expense to purchase house property which had become unfit for occupation by reason of age, decay, neglect, and selfish indifference to the requirements of health and decency. To do so would be to reward the owners who, in many cases, have bought for a nominal price worn-out properties, only fit for being pulled down, and have got a much higher per-centage for their outlay than they could have got from property in good condition. I think it would be unjust to the owners of better property. I believe the principle to be unsound that dwellings, any more than food or clothing, should be found for one class of the community at the expense of the rest.

Chairman.

740. Will you put that Paper in?—These are my opinions. (*The Witness delivered in the Paper.*)

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

741. Can you state shortly the remedy that you would apply to get rid of the slums and rookeries of the metropolis; have you anything more to say beyond what you have already said?—I think that the municipal authorities should be clothed with much stronger powers for dealing with bad property, property that is either structurally unfit or sanitarily unfit; I would not allow any municipal authority to buy such property with a view of making it better; but I would compel those owning the property either to put it in a proper state or pull it down.

Chairman.

742. You went to Glasgow to inquire into this matter?—Yes.

743. Are you aware, before the Glasgow Street Improvements Act, where the great portion of the labouring population were living in Glasgow?—Yes.

744. Where?—In the old part of Glasgow reaching up to the cathedral.

745. In the centre?—Not in the centre as it is now; it is more to the east of Glasgow.

746. I wish to know whether the labouring population who were living in the centre of Glasgow had not to walk to their work, which lay

Chairman—continued.

out of the centre?—No, I think it would be the reverse process, most of the work lying in the centre of Glasgow. I have known Glasgow since I was a boy; I was born there, and I lived not a very great way from it.

747. But still a great portion of the work which was going on was not going on in the centre of the town?—There is a great deal in the centre; of course the manufactories of cotton and iron, and other works, are upon the outskirts.

748. That is exactly what I was referring to. There was a great deal of going out into the outskirts?—A great deal.

749. I understand, and understood when I was in Glasgow a few years ago, that Mr. Morrison's idea at that time was that if you took a pair of compasses and put one leg of the compasses where these people were working, and the other where they were dwelling in the interior, it appeared that it was just as convenient to them when you reversed the compass and made them live on the outside instead of living in the centre of the town?—Yes.

750. They would be just as near their work, and would be much better housed?—Better housed, certainly.

751. That was an illustration given to me by Mr. Morrison when I visited Glasgow in 1874?—I met Mr. Morrison, and had a great deal of conversation with him, and I have a Paper which he published on that subject.

752. You do not object to that statement of mine?—No; except in this, that Glasgow is a more densely populated place than London is, on the average,

753. Now in regard to the overcrowding in Glasgow, there was at that time a very great deal of overcrowding, was there not?—A very great deal.

754. And this was pointed out to me, that from the fact of a great number of places having been pulled down the overcrowding had become worse; did you go into that question at all?—I went into the question in consequence of the clause in their Act requiring them to get the certificate of the Sheriff of Lanarkshire, that there was sufficient accommodation elsewhere, before they could take down houses; and as I have stated both in the printed report which I have handed in, and in the statement which I have now made, they had no difficulty whatever in showing that at the time they made the different clearances there existed from seven to eight times the amount of empty accommodation that there was in the houses which they were about to pull down.

755. That is exactly what I understood, but nevertheless, notwithstanding all that, the result was a great increase of overcrowding?—No, I think not.

756. Did you inquire into that fact?—Yes, I did, and I have given in the report which I have handed in, the number of empty houses in the different years, one after another.

757. I do not talk about empty houses: I ask whether in the crowded places in Glasgow there did not succeed the first operation of their Act great overcrowding?—I think not. The information which they gave to me was rather to the

Chairman—continued.

effect that they extended their operations over such a length of time that it never produced any marked difference for the worse.

758. Did you inquire from the police upon that matter?—Not the police; I met Mr. Morrison and I met the town clerk, and the surveyor and engineer to the City and their several assistants, and I went to see the places mentioned in my report.

759. You take this broad view: that you would not compel any municipal authority or such a body as the Board of Works, either to buy the houses at all, or if they had bought them you would then free them from all obligation as to building up?—I would.

760. In fact, you would destroy both parts of the Acts absolutely, both the destructive part of the Act and the constructive part of the Act?—Both of them, with the exception of this: that where property was unfit for human habitation the municipal authority ought to have power to cause it either to be shut up or taken down.

761. But you would not have it bought?—No.

762. And would not have any rebuilding?—I would not have it bought or rebuilt upon their authority, *i. e.*, by them.

763. You are the engineer to the Board?—Yes, assistant-engineer.

764. Is that the advice that you have tendered to the Board?—That is the result of my report, which I have handed in.

765. Is that the advice which you, as engineer or sub-engineer, tendered to your Board?—It is.

766. From the commencement of the Act of 1875?—From the commencement of 1877. In 1877 I was sent down.

767. Therefore you have always held up to the Board, as far as you could, that both parts of the Act were wrong?—Yes.

768. And you have induced all the members of the Board whom you could, by your advice, to act upon that opinion?—My duty was done when I made my report; but I have not hesitated to express my opinion to different members. Officially I have had no occasion to do more than hand in my report.

769. So far as you have gone your influence has been used against both the provisions of the Act?—That is the inference of my report.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

770. But you were never consulted as to the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act beyond this?—I was not either before or after.

771. You have never given your opinion in any way, except in this Paper?—No.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

772. Do I rightly understand you to say that supposing that you had to carry out in London an Act such as the Glasgow Act, you would protect the working classes from undue disturbance by destroying the houses gradually?—Just so.

773. That, you consider, is one of the main features of the Glasgow Act?—It is.

Mr. *Torrens.*

774. You became the advising engineer of the Board in 1877?—I have been assistant engineer to this Board since its formation, and was seven years before the formation of this Board engineer to the previous Commissioners of Sewers.

775. But your attention was specially directed to this subject in 1877?—1877 was the first time, and the only time, that I have been officially called upon to take any part.

776. Was the impression left upon your mind, from what you saw in Glasgow, and from what you heard there, favourable to the policy of the Glasgow Corporation; did you think they were wise in obtaining the Act and in carrying it out?—They have acted, I think, very wisely indeed. They were empowered to do things which they did not think it wise to do; for instance, to devote the land, or any part of the land, if they thought proper, exclusively to dwellings for the poorest classes; they have not followed that policy. They were authorised by another clause to build, and they have not built, with the exception of lodging-houses, from which they derive a profit.

777. The reason why they did not build was, as I understood from the Provost when he was here, that they found it easy always to let the land which they had in their power to persons who would build?—They found no difficulty whatever.

778. And they took care always to let sufficient, and to have sufficient occupied for building for a particular house before they pulled it down?—Yes.

779. Did you suggest to the Metropolitan Board in London any similar policy?—No, the result of my observation was that it was unnecessary for the Board to do it, and I think I have proved that, by the result of the census of 1881. There were at the time of the taking of that census unoccupied houses to the number of about 37,000, besides about 7,000 more that were being built.

780. But am I not correct in asking you whether Parliament has not been advised that in the course of the 10 years to which your observation applies there are fewer houses in London, in proportion to the population, than there were?—No, you will find, on examining the three last decennial censuses, as also by examining the annual reports of the Police Commissioners, that the proportion of occupants per house is almost exactly the same in each one of those decennial periods, namely, $7\frac{3}{4}$ persons per house.

781. The accommodation, I apprehend, of any population is not merely the number of cubic feet that are occupied by the buildings, but is the accessibility and obtainability, so to speak, of the house accommodation. Is it not true that the total rateable house property in London is greater in proportion to the population than it was?—The house property in existence at the last census for the population was as great as it was 10 years before. I can give you the figures.

782. Have you here the Return of your own Board that was presented to Parliament some three or four years ago?—I have not, and as I have not had anything to do with making the Return,

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

Return, I should not be able to say anything about it. The census of the 4th of April 1881, gave the unrevised number of the population as returned to me from the Registrar General's Office at 3,814,571; of inhabited houses, 486,286; of uninhabited houses, 36,929; and of houses building, 7,700. The uninhabited houses formed 7 per cent. of the whole number; those building 1½ per cent. more. The uninhabited houses would afford accommodation, allowing the same average number per house, for 291,000 persons; those being built would accommodate 60,676, making together 351,676 persons. The census in 1871 showed a population of 3,266,987; the number of inhabited houses at that time was 419,642; the increase in the number of houses in 10 years was 69,353; the proportion of persons per house in 1871 was 7·785; and in 1881 the proportion was 7·837; so that for all practical purposes they were alike.

783. Are the figures that you give there the total number of rateable houses or inhabited houses?—They are returned as inhabited houses.

784. Then plus that there is the whole of the rateable property that is not inhabited, the whole of the mercantile property?—That is exactly what was returned to me.

785. I want to know what the figure means; was it the rateable value that was returned there or the inhabited houses?—The inhabited houses.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

786. You said that in Glasgow they had only built two houses in Drygate-street?—Two tenements, they call them lodging-houses.

787. But it is the case, is it not, that they have built three lodging-houses, and that two other lodging houses are in progress for the homeless poor?—They have now built seven lodging-houses for letting to men and women at 3*d.* and 4*d.* a night; that is done, according to the town clerk's letter to me, as a matter of safety.

Chairman.

788. How a matter of safety?—In a sanitary point of view. From a criminal point of view there were large numbers of people hovering between working honestly and living dishonestly.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

789. Those houses were not built, so to speak, to meet the persons displaced by improvements, but rather to provide for the floating population of the lowest kind, you may almost say semi-criminal?—Yes, generally speaking single persons, men or women without families; in fact, exclusively so; they will not take families.

Mr. ROBERT REID, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

790. WHAT is your exact position with reference to the Metropolitan Board of Works?—I am in an independent position, but I am often called in to advise the Board.

791. Are you consulting engineer?—No, I am a surveyor. I have had many cases against the Board; some of them settled adversely to them; and in many cases I have been consulted by them.

792. You have been a surveyor for a large number of years?—Nearly 40.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

793. You are a surveyor and auctioneer in large practice in London?—Yes.

794. Have you not, during the last 30 years, had considerable experience as a land surveyor in London?—I have.

795. Have you not sold property very largely at the Auction Mart, and were you not some few years since concerned in the sale of a large area of houses in Whitechapel, let to weekly tenants?—I have sold by auction at the Mart, during the last 30 years, properties of considerable value, and in October 1877, and April 1878, I sold 236 houses in Spitalfields, covering an area of about 3 *a.* 0 *r.* 15 *p.*, and let principally to weekly tenants, at rents amounting to about 8,000 *l.* per annum, and they produced at auction 115,960 *l.*

796. Have you had occasion to consider the terms of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, both as a surveyor concerned for claimants, and as a witness on the part of the Board, in several cases of appeals from the final awards of arbitrators?—I have, very frequently.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

797. Do you consider that it will ever be possible, under the terms of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts to clear sites densely covered by unhealthy tenements except at a very great cost?—It can only be done at very great cost, and I find on referring to the data that the cost of the six sites cleared and since purchased by the Peabody Trustees ranged from 11 *s.* 6 *d.* to 37 *s.* 3 *d.* per foot.

798. Will not that cost be augmented if the Board has to acquire sanitary property for the purpose of re-housing the labouring classes?—It would certainly be so. When they have to purchase sanitary property it is more expensive than that within the condemned area.

Chairman.

799. That is not part of the obligation in the Act of Parliament?—In some cases they have had to take sanitary property to complete the schemes.

800. In order to get light and air, not for the purpose of housing the people?—They could not very well house them without the light and air.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

801. Are the areas which have been acquired by the Board under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Acts, when cleared, better adapted for commercial purposes than for the erection of labourers' dwellings?—You would get a larger rental without a doubt.

802. Do you consider that there would be much

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

much demand for sites for labourers' dwellings if the obligation was imposed upon the lessee or purchaser perpetually to dedicate such sites to artizans' or labourers' dwellings?—I do not. I think that any restrictions are prejudicial to letting or purchasing, and an obligation to dedicate in perpetuity, for any special purpose, seriously depreciates the saleable value of property, and when restricted to labourers' dwellings would largely do so, as they might prove unsuccessful from change of circumstances; and as they could be applied to no other purpose they would be altogether unmarketable.

803. Speaking generally, would you consider the price of 3 *d.* per foot, obtained by the Board from the Peabody Trustees for sites to be dedicated to labourers' dwellings, as much as the Board could reasonably have expected to obtain under the conditions of the agreement?—I have carefully considered the areas and made diligent inquiry where sites have been covered by companies, and my opinion is that, looking at the sites altogether, there are some cheap at 3 *d.* per foot and some dear at 3 *d.* per foot; but taking the six sites together I think the price is as reasonable and fair a price as could be obtained under the circumstances.

804. Have you formed any opinion as to the means that should be taken to clear away such houses as are included in the artizans' area, and can you suggest a way in which the accommodation can be provided for the persons displaced?—I believe the most satisfactory way of finding accommodation for the persons displaced would be to give them a few pounds, according to circumstances, to pay expenses, and leave them to find their own dwellings, and that they would readily do so, and the houses included in the artizans' areas could then be cleared away.

805. Do you think that the inhabitants of these slums would be permitted to occupy the buildings of the Peabody Trustees, and other places of the same character?—The Peabody Trustees will not permit them to occupy their buildings, and such is more or less the case with all the artizans' dwellings companies, and thus the persons, such as men with large families and small wages, for whom it is more particularly desired to provide dwellings, are excluded. The lowest classes, however, would probably not live in them if they had the opportunity.

806. Do you think that, without compulsory powers, a body like the Metropolitan Board of Works could acquire areas for the erection of labourers' dwellings?—It would be found quite impracticable to purchase any area of any extent without compulsory powers.

807. Would it not be difficult to suggest where an open space of this kind could be obtained near the metropolis?—I know of no areas within a couple of miles of Charing Cross, and have recently applied to more than 30 of the principal surveyors in London without being able to find a suitable area.

808. If sites are cleared for the erection of labourers' dwellings in order that the sites comprised in the artizans' area may be devoted to commercial purposes, would not the new sites often be occupied by labourers' dwellings, so that there would still be an ultimate displacement of the labouring classes?—I know of no areas which do not contain an existing population quite as dense as those for which it is desired to provide; and hence, in satisfying one difficulty, another would be created.

809. Have you read the form of tender for letting the Whitechapel area before it was let to the Peabody Trustees, and do you consider it objectionable?—I have; and I consider the conditions, arbitrary as they appear to be, would not interfere with the letting. They are almost identical with those under which lands belonging to the Corporation of the City of London, the City Companies, and charitable bodies are offered, and difficulties are not found to arise therefrom. This is, no doubt, owing to its being well known and invariably found that the architects or surveyors of such bodies do not require unreasonable modifications or alterations in plans prepared in accordance with the description of building which it is well known to both parties to the tender it is desired should be erected. Moreover, similar conditions are not found to act prejudicially where lands are let by public auction, and the names of the architects are not published. It is obvious that owners of land on which it is desired to secure ground rents would not long permit the prejudices or crotchets of their architects to interfere with the object in view. The conditions of the Board also give further security against caprice by the provision that the Secretary of State shall have a voice in the matter.

810. Is it not the practice in large building estates to put the lessees very much into the hands of the surveyor or architect of the owner, and does this practically interfere with the letting of the land?—They are frequently put into the hands of surveyors and architects, and I do not find that it in any way interferes with the letting of the land.

Mr. *John Holland.*

811. You said something about dedicating lands in perpetuity to artizans' dwellings; is that ordered by the Act?—It has recently been limited to 10 years.

812. Does it not strike you that if it is limited to 10 years it would be possible for anyone to buy these lands cheaply for artizans' dwellings, and use them for that purpose for 10 years, and sell them subsequently for commercial purposes at a greatly increased price?—If they once erect buildings they would be far too expensive to remove; you would have to clear the ground again and destroy an immense amount of valuable property.

813. Supposing that they were much more valuable for commercial purposes it might pay to do that?—It might, but they must be very much more valuable, because there would be many thousands of pounds spent upon the area.

Mr. *Rankin.*

814. You said you did not know of any areas within two miles of Charing Cross that could be used for building artizans' dwellings; do you know of any areas within five miles?—When you get into the suburbs there are plenty; West Ham, in Essex, for instance.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

815. Is five miles too far for workmen to come if they have tramways or railways?—No, I do not think it is. It has always appeared to me that a vast number of the working class could be provided for by means of tramways and railways if it were made incumbent upon the railway and tramway companies to carry the labouring classes at convenient hours in the morning and evening, and on Saturdays in the middle of the day, at a low rate of fare. My impression has always been that it would be much better for them instead of concentrating so many of the working classes upon a limited area; it would be much more to their health and benefit; in fact many of them do avail themselves of it. I travel down a line of railway night and morning, and I find that whereas at Westbourne Park station ten years ago scarcely any working men got out, now between five and six at night an immense number do alight; in fact the third class carriages are crammed to suffocation. A few years ago a very large number of houses in the neighbourhood of Westbourne Park were untenanted; I have had occasion to visit them recently, and they are all now tenanted by respectable artizans. A painter takes a house at 8 *s.* or 10 *s.* a week, and he takes another workman who works with him as a joiner, and they divide the house between them.

816. You said you would give those who were dislodged from the condemned dwellings a certain sum of money, and that they would easily find other dwellings: are there, in your opinion, many unoccupied dwellings in the metropolis where those persons could be taken in?—It would be difficult to point them out in densely populated positions, but practically there is no difficulty about it. They settle themselves much more comfortably and conveniently to their own wishes if they have the money, and are allowed to use it in any way they like.

817. Do you know the number of unoccupied dwellings in the metropolis?—I do not.

818. Would I be right in saying that about 45,000 persons could be accommodated at the present time in unoccupied houses?—Within what area; within five miles of Charing Cross?

819. In the metropolitan district?—In the metropolitan area there are plenty of empty houses; there have been hundreds of houses of a small class built lately.

Mr. *Torrens.*

820. I understood you to say you would prefer giving a small sum of money as compensation where there was a dispossession, to attempting the replacing of people in other houses?—I see no reason why it should not succeed. There would be no difficulty about it if you gave them the money; they would find a place satisfactory to themselves, and you would get rid of the difficulty.

821. When you say "get rid of the difficulty," you mean that you would get rid of the people?—And the difficulty of housing them.

822. But you have not got rid of the slums?—As to the slums, if Mr. Torrens' Act were applied as it might be, it would get rid of the slums.

823. In other words, there are zones round the centre of the metropolis which are perhaps

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

not definable, but which are distinguishable by their density of population?—There are not so many zones, but there is a great centre.

824. You spoke of Westbourne Park, and that district; how far is that from the centre of the working population?—It would be more than two miles from the Post Office.

825. Beyond that there is a district not so thickly populated?—Yes, beyond that there are a great many; Fulham, for instance. The District Railway lately opened a station there.

826. Have you had occasion to go into the actual condition of these outer rims or zones, or whatever you call them?—I am now engaged in preparing the particulars of sale of 25 acres of houses and various buildings in Camberwell, and I have been into every one of the houses; I do not know how many hundred yet; I have not summed up the whole, but with the exception of those in the High-street and some of the principal streets, they are all occupied by the working classes. Some of the people have been there for 60 years and 70 years, and one man is 90 years old, and his father was in the house before him.

827. How many families are there generally in a house?—These houses are very small.

828. Are they cottages?—Some of the houses have eight-roomed houses; in many of them there is a family in each room.

829. Take the northern side of London, and I am not going too far from St. Giles's, we will say, have you had occasion to ascertain, for instance, so that you might report upon it if called upon, what is the condition of the inhabitancy of the district north of Holborn and north of the New-road?—The alleys and courts in Gray's Inn-lane are very densely populated, and if you get up to Somers Town there are a great many streets very densely populated. Many of the houses have been pulled down by the Midland Railway.

830. Do you know Stroud Vale?—I know there is such a place where artizans' dwellings have been built.

831. Could you tell the Committee now what your opinion is as to the density of the inhabitancy of Stroud Vale?—No, I could not tell you.

832. So if the people are turned out from the centre, and are left to shift for themselves, and to go to a district within a reasonable limit like Stroud Vale, you cannot tell what becomes of them there as regards density?—No.

833. Consequently you do not know whether the slum is only transferred from the centre to the outer rim?—There are a great many slums in the outer rim.

834. Does not slums go on oozing outwards?—It does everywhere exist, and that is where, as I just now said, there is a strong hand wanted to destroy the houses in those places.

835. Is there nothing to be done to reinstate them?—Yes; I would suggest that wherever a house is let in lodgings to weekly tenants there should be a competent authority to examine the house.

836. Over the whole property of London?—Over the whole property in these dense positions.

837. And who should be the authority?—It

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

has not been carried out by the vestries. It might be carried out by the Metropolitan Board of Works. It must be some independent person who has nothing whatever to do with the vestries, and outside the control of the parties who have an interest in, and who possibly derive an income from some of the houses. I have known in my own experience on many occasions that these houses do belong to gentlemen who hold a parochial position, and consequently (or, at least, it appears to me that that is the cause; I can assign no other) the law is not enforced. A short time ago, in Edmund-place, Aldersgate-street, I had occasion for a client to destroy about 40 houses occupied by the working classes, and had negotiations to complete with the Commissioners of Sewers and the Goldsmiths' Company a scheme for re-building. I could not pull them down unless I left the ground vacant, which would have been a great nuisance, and had to keep the houses in my hands six months after the original ground lease expired. The moment I became possessed of the houses, though I had only to keep them up six months, I was applied to to provide drains, and to do a variety of other things. I believe, judging from the state of the houses when they came into my hands, there had been no such rigid enforcement of sanitary rules for a very long time before.

838. If I understood your evidence rightly, the upshot of your advice would be that you would only call in the Board of Works, or arm the Board of Works with the power to pull down, if necessary, any houses or dilapidated or unsanitary dwellings, and compensate the people moderately for the dispossession, and when they went into the outer rim to prevent them from being too thickly populated, you would give power to the Metropolitan Board of Works to superintend, investigate, and control the letting of houses in that neighbourhood?—Not the letting. In every case where a house is let to weekly tenants, I would suggest that power be given to an authority to enter and view, and enforce the maintaining in repair in a manner that would be required by the covenants usual in leases, and the providing of adequate cisterns and water-closet accommodation. I have frequently seen in one street houses in good condition forming exceedingly comfortable dwellings, and others of the same age, but grossly neglected, and unfit to live in, owing to their being rented by a class of men, who are very numerous, who, with little or no capital, make good incomes by taking as many houses as they can obtain, and subletting to weekly tenants, executing no repairs they can possibly avoid, and extracting very high rents, frequently double the amount they pay. The expense of supervision might be met by a small license fee. Where repairs are not executed in pursuance to order, the authority should have the power to do them, and to charge the owner with the cost; that is, supposing the property is capable of repair. Even in the Newport-market site there are many houses that might be repaired and maintained if they had been looked after a few years ago; and if there had been proper supervision, it appears to me there would be no lack of appropriate dwellings for the working classes.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

839. Have you calculated what amount of staff it would require to enable the Board of Works, in addition to its other engagements, to look after the inhabitants of the whole of the outer portions of London?—I think it might be met by a fee. It is not the letting, but the occasional visiting that is required. Poor people are afraid to speak to anyone going in. When I visit them, they fancy sometimes I am an inspector, and they are afraid of being turned out if they make the slightest complaint. If a man of experience went there the supervision might be kept up. It is a miserable state that these houses are allowed to get into because men want to make as large a profit as they can. With regard to the Peabody Buildings, I find by taking out the figures that they provide for about two persons a room. Now it has always appeared to me that the people who ought to be provided for are those who have large families. I have found them located seven or eight in a room, in a most miserable state. Their wages are very small. I have seen heaps of something they call bedding in a room, and the whole furniture comprising only a chair and a table. Those are the people who are not provided for by the model dwelling-houses, and it seems to me very hard indeed that they should remain as they are, and I believe that altering those houses would not be anything like the expense of pulling down and making model lodging-houses.

840. What do you mean by altering them?—Improving them.

841. Who would alter or improve them?—You might have a general plan suggested and considered. For instance, some of those houses have been built for private individuals. Those very houses in Newport-market, put up in the reign of Queen Anne, and in Dudley-street in the reign of Charles, were built for the accommodation of one family. There is only one water-closet, one cistern, one scullery, and yet you find every room in the house occupied by a family.

842. I want to know what remedy is to be effected?—The remedy could be effected by the erection of a rear building, and so increasing the accommodation.

843. Who is to make the additional building?—I would enforce it upon the owners of the property if it were practicable.

844. Do you consider it practicable for the occupiers and owners of properties to alter their private houses?—It could only be enforced by Act of Parliament.

845. Who is to be the authority to do it?—I think if it is too much labour for the Metropolitan Board of Works, an authority should be appointed for it.

846. A new authority?—It could be done if carried out in the way I have suggested. I have seen many houses destroyed that I think could have been saved, and the expense would have been much less had sanitary steps been carried out in those cases.

847. What we want to get at is the remedy; I thought, perhaps, you could suggest something to lead us to a remedy as to what the authority was to be, and how their powers were to be exercised?—I hardly presume to go so far as that; it is a matter which I thought might come under the

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

the cognizance of such a body as the Board of Works, and that any staff might be made self-paying by a license fee; there is a large amount of property of this kind for which large rents are obtained, by being improperly let, and it is only fair if they are let at high rents, that the houses should be complete in a sanitary point of view.

848. I will give you an instance of houses not in the suburbs at all, but in a street like Lambs' Conduit-street, in the neighbourhood of Holborn, which would not exactly come under your description of having been built in former times for a single family, but which have been occupied by a family; houses with a good shop underneath, and let out in lodgings above; you know, I suppose, what the number of families are at present in such houses as those?—I should not suppose that the houses in Lambs' Conduit-street are densely occupied.

849. Would you be surprised if I told you that, without exception, there is on every floor a family, and that there is often a family in every room?—Every floor I should suppose would hold a separate family.

850. That makes six families?—I should hardly have thought that there would have been a family in every room in Lambs' Conduit-street.

851. Would you compel those houses to be altered?—Where they are let to weekly tenants they should provide the accommodation necessary for weekly tenants to live in. I could tell you of houses in Newport Market where the rack rental being 40 *l.*, 80 *l.* and 90 *l.* are produced by the weekly rents, the owner could get a fair amount for his property, and the middleman who takes it (but I would get rid of middlemen as far as possible) could get a fair legitimate profit without screwing 100 per cent. out of the rents. I can give you details where every room is occupied, and instead of two people occupying rooms, as they are able to do in the Peabody Buildings at 2 *s.* or 3 *s.*, these people are paying 4 *s.* 6 *d.* to 5 *s.* for much worse accommodation; in fact, it is horrible accommodation.

Mr. *Cropper.*

852. I get the impression from you that you do not think that the people who are turned out desire special accommodation in the quarter of the town from which they are turned out?—Very many of them do, I think, and they find it.

853. In fact they are occupied in those parts of the town where they live?—Many of them are. Many take the opportunity when once they are turned out of going away. If they have lived a long time in these places, like the people who will be removed from Camberwell who have been living there 30 and 40 years, they will never go if left alone, but if removed from there, they might not elect to live in houses close by, particularly if there were cheap trains; and, considering that the railway companies have great privileges, it appears to me that a concession to the railways might include a stipulation that they should provide cheap trains at reasonable hours in the morning and evening.

854. That is not what I ask; I want to know whether you think they would have to come back

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

daily to the places where you turn them out of?—No, a great many of them would not; their occupation is changed. A working man and his sons, the members of a family, cannot live for 30 years employed in one place.

855. I am aware that the people prefer to live where they and their children have long lived, in London, as in Ireland and elsewhere; but you think that it is not because their occupation leads them to prefer the place, but merely because they find themselves there?—I think if they were once removed they would go far away into the suburban district.

856. And it would be as profitable for them, according to your observation, to do that as to stay where they find themselves?—Quite.

857. According to your idea, by a small payment to each of these people they would be just as well off after they were turned out as before?—They would gradually suit themselves; there is no doubt of that. I have spoken to many of these people at Camberwell, and have asked whether they would like these model dwellings. There is one going to be put up in Peckham; they have a great horror of it, but I think that if they had the opportunity of going into comfortable dwellings they would not go back to these places, and if they were removed from these places they would find themselves more comfortable than they previously were.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

858. You told us that the conditions imposed by the Metropolitan Board of Works were, in your opinion, fair and reasonable conditions; are you referring to those imposed upon the Peabody Trustees?—The Peabody Trustees are merely under the conditions of the Act of Parliament.

859. You are not aware then that the conditions laid upon the Peabody Trustees are totally different to those given to any other person, as was told us by Mr. Richardson in answer to Question 5500?—I was not aware of that. They are under the restrictions of the Act, and I believe that the conditions are drawn, so far as may be, under the directions of the Act.

860. As a matter of fact they are different. I want to know what conditions you are referring to; are you aware that the conditions of the Metropolitan Board of Works were altered in November or December 1878?—Yes, I can give you one of the conditions to which I refer.

861. I want to know what is the date of the conditions you refer to as being reasonable, fair, and satisfactory?—March 1879.

862. Then that was after the original conditions that were issued by the Metropolitan Board of Works had been altered. The Metropolitan Board of Works altered the terms of their conditions in November or December 1878?—Yes.

863. When you say that the conditions that are issued by the Metropolitan Board of Works are fair and reasonable in your judgment, are you referring to the conditions published after 1878, or before 1878?—I have them both, and I refer to both of them. I have both sets of conditions by me.

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

864. Are you aware that the conditions were materially altered?—Yes.

865. Do you differ from the witnesses we have had before us in thinking that the conditions which were issued before 1878 were fair and reasonable?—I will refresh my memory by referring to the conditions issued before 1878. I have seen both sets of conditions, and I do not think that either of them are such that there would be any objection to working under.

866. You differ both from Mr. Gatliffe and Mr. Moore, and others who have considered that the first set of conditions are such as no commercial man would make an offer under?—I do; I have taken land for clients under these conditions.

867. Under which conditions?—Under the Northumberland Avenue conditions.

868. That was since 1878?—I should not have hesitated to have taken land under the first conditions.

869. In the Northumberland Avenue you had no such conditions as those under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—They are similar; I have compared them, and they are the same as the revised conditions.

870. Under the ordinary conditions of the Metropolitan Board you have not to build a certain class of buildings?—I do not refer to a certain class of buildings, but to the supervision of the architect.

871. The great difficulty was as to conditions respecting the buildings that had to be placed upon the land which was sold?—Yes, I believe so.

872. And those are the conditions to which I was drawing your attention?—But the conditions only provided that such a building as that desired, should be put there, and no one who was prepared to tender and to put up such a building as was required would, I think, have objected to the conditions.

873. Are you not aware that the conditions made in the case of the Peabody Trustees are very different and much more favourable?—They leave out some few words.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*.

874. You refer to 25 acres of land at Camberwell, which you have surveyed lately, covered with houses?—Yes.

875. What character of houses are they?—A good deal of it is shop and public-house property, and some houses in Camberwell Green, with a vast quantity of small property behind it

876. Are they all small houses?—They are small houses; some detached.

877. Are they generally occupied by one family or more?—They are generally occupied by two or three; one man takes the house at 8*s.* or 10*s*, a week, and sublets a part of it.

878. Do you know where the people find their occupation?—I am not going to destroy these houses; I did not go carefully into the question of occupation. They are working people.

879. It seems from your previous evidence that you consider the working men do not necessarily live within reach of their occupation, but that they

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

are spread all about in every direction?—Not necessarily. There are some occupations, such as dock labourers and others, who work close by; but as to a vast number of others, such as builders and men connected with the building trade, as soon as a contract on which they are engaged is over in one part of London, their employment may be in another part, and they have hitherto been in the habit of walking from one place to another, sometimes three or four miles, whereas if an arrangement was made with a railway company they would be no worse off.

Chairman.

880. Although, I daresay, a good many of these people might go away, there must be a good many whom it would be a great hardship to turn off?—There are many cases where it is very desirable that they should live there.

881. You would not put to the Committee that it would be a wise thing to destroy all these places, and turn all the people adrift?—No.

882. You would not advise that these 20,000 people should be paid so much and turned adrift?—Not all at once; certainly not.

883. Have you advised the Board in any of these matters?—No; my advice has been only in compensation matters.

884. I do not understand how you come here; do you come as the adviser of the Board?—I come at the instigation of the Board to give my experience. I have had large experience in dealing with property and letting it.

885. I can understand your coming to speak of the present value of property, but your evidence has generally been directed to other parts of the matter?—I have had considerable experience in my duties with reference to compensations, and that has made me acquainted with these matters.

886. We have not had the advantage of your experience with reference to that point, and I therefore want to know what you come here to tell us?—It was principally with reference to how the artizans might be easily removed, and the impossibility and the difficulty in carrying out the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, except at great expense to the ratepayers.

887. You come to tell us that these artizans might be removed by railways elsewhere; that is your object in coming here?—Yes; and I might, if you thought necessary, give my experience with regard to the cost.

888. You have not done so. All that you have come to say is that, in your opinion as a surveyor and being perfectly well competent to advise upon the value of property, you come to give your opinion as to whether it is advisable to allow these people to shift for themselves, receiving a certain amount in money compensation?—And as to the cost that the ratepayers will be put to in carrying out the provisions of the Act.

889. That has been proved; it does not become the more true because it has been proved twice. In your opinion these people might be turned adrift with a pound or two in their pockets, and that is what you come to tell us?—I come

Chairman—continued.

I come to tell you, if you have not heard of it already.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

890. Can you make any practical suggestion as to the questions which are referred by Parliament to this Committee, and as to carrying out the Act in a cheaper and more efficient manner?—I would venture to suggest that the expense of working the Act might be reduced by abolishing the provisional and final awards, and that although the clause in the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act making provision for settling the amount of compensation is perhaps sufficient if strictly adhered to, it is not so in practice, and that more express directions are consequently necessary; and I think some such directions as the following might be useful, namely, to classify the property to be taken into three divisions. First, property which has been maintained in fair condition, such as property held under covenants usual in leases, and this should be estimated at the fair market value. Secondly, property which from neglect or the rapacity of middlemen, or other causes, has been allowed to fall into bad condition; this should be estimated at the fair market value, subject to the cost of putting into repair as aforesaid being deducted. And, thirdly, property that has been permitted to become ruinous and in an insanitary condition, which should be estimated at the value of the land and the old materials.

[*As to the Metropolitan Street Improvement Acts, 1872 and 1877.*]

891. Have you considered the terms of the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act of 1872 with reference to certain plots of land therein allocated as sites for the labouring classes?—I have.

892. Do you think that there would be much demand for sites to be perpetually dedicated to the labouring classes?—I think not; the dedication in perpetuity for any special purpose seriously depreciates the saleable value of property.

893. Do you think that the terms of Section 49 of the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act of 1872, under which the Board has power to let, are calculated to deter persons from making tenders?—I do; and the arbitration clause of that Act, by which any difference between the Board and any person making an offer for any plot, including the amount of purchase-money or rent to be inserted in the contract, is to be determined by an arbitrator to be appointed by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, whose decision is to be binding on all parties, is, I consider, very prejudicial, for few persons would risk being bound to pay a rent that might result in certain loss.

894. Apart, however, from any difficulty in form of tender, would the obligation to perpetually dedicate the land to the working classes greatly diminish its value in the market?—I think it would, and to a very serious extent.

895. Referring to the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act, 1877, have you considered the effect of the 33rd section of that Act?—I have.

896. Do you think it practicable for the Board to carry out their Western street improvements as authorised, subject to those conditions?—No, I do not.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

897. Will you tell the Committee why you think so, and please state the practical objections which apply?—I think it is simply impracticable, as it requires that suitable dwellings shall be erected on sites that cannot be cleared; for until some clearance is effected no progress can be made. The powers of the Board, moreover, do not include the erection of dwellings, but are confined to clearing sites, and selling or letting them for that purpose. It does not seem to have been considered that in carrying out a street improvement, or in laying out land for building, the first thing to be done is to form the road and sewers. Roads are necessary, not only that the buildings when erected may be approached, but for the conveyance of materials to erect them; and without sewers the dwellings could not be occupied: a clearance sufficient for these purposes is therefore absolutely necessary. The condition referred to has been somewhat relaxed by the Secretary of State having in respect of the Newport Market scheme given his consent to the buildings beings taken down in successive sections, but as the sites to be cleared are in almost all, if not all, cases occupied by the labouring class, and accommodation is to be provided for the same number of persons as those displaced, and the buildings to be erected are to contain improved accommodation to those destroyed, it can only be done by carrying them up to a great height. To clear, let, and cover in successive sections would occupy a considerable time, and consequently each improvement would be years before it could be completed, and the difficulty of finding persons to take the land would, under such circumstances, be greatly increased, there being always a great disinclination to build on land when the completion of a street or scheme may be indefinitely prolonged.

898. What do you suggest as the best way of dealing with labouring classes displaced in the execution of street improvements?—I have already answered that to a very considerable extent. I consider the best course would be to allow them to provide for themselves in their own way, and that a few pounds, according to circumstances, be given them to meet expenses. I observed, also, that Parliament, during last Session, gave railway companies workable clauses, as to the labouring classes. In the last Metropolitan District Railway Bill there was a clause inserted which gave them workable clauses.

Chairman.

899. What do you mean by "workable clauses?"—I find, in the last Session of Parliament, in the Metropolitan District Railway Act, in the 11th clause, there is this passage in parenthesis, "unless the company and such person or persons otherwise agree;" that leaves it to the company as it would to the Board, to agree with these people as to where they should go. The clause provides that, "Before taking, in any parish, 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partly by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, the company shall (unless the

Chairman—continued.

company and such person or persons otherwise agree) procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person or persons," and so on.

900. Would it not be neeessary, if the Metropolitan Board of Works had to replace artizans upon these improvements, that almost the whole of the streets would be occupied by artizans?—Undoubtedly.

901. Would it be desirable to have artizans' dwellings from one end of a large street to the other?—I think not.

902. Would it not rather depreciate the value of the property?—Yes, particularly the property opposite not taken by the Board; they may take but one side of the street.

903. You think it much more advisable to try to get some plots elsewhere for the artizans, and allow these sites to be sold for commercial purposes?—Yes; unless at the baek of these there could be sites obtained; it would be difficult to go elsewhere within a reasonable distanee, because you would have to elear the land again.

904. You would give the people facilities for going into the suburbs?—Yes.

905. You have said that there are facilities existing through tramways and railways?—There would be if the fares were made cheap enough; there are plenty of houses in every direction; for instance, down in the neighbourhood of Stratford and Lea Bridge, where I have been lately.

906. I suppose, as a surveyor of great experience, you say you are not astonished at the Metropolitan Board of Works being obliged to hesitate before they carry out these improvements, considering the stringeney of the 33rd seetion?—I am not at all surprised; I think it impossible for them to go on.

907. Have you in your experience ever seen or heard any seetion so stringent as the 33rd section of the Aet of 1877?—No, it seems to be impossible to work it.

908. Is it not an exceptionally stringent seetion?—I never met with one like it.

909. You never met with such a section in any Railway Act or in any Improvement Aet for Birmingham, or any other large town?—I never met with any such clause.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

910. I rather gather that, supposing there was in this 33rd seetion a saving clause like that which you quoted from the Metropolitan District Railway Act of last year, it would meet the diffieulty?—It would.

911. Do you think that that would be suffieient to meet the difficulty?—In clearing the sites it would; the Board would then be able to clear the sites which at present they cannot do except in sections, and it would appear that if they were to clear 15 or 20 houses at a time, the improvement would take years in carrying out, in consequence of the necessary notices and the process that has to be gone through.

912. I suppose that would only apply to finding accommodation for those that are displaced; you would so alter the Act that the Board should be compelled to find accommodation for those displaced, unless they can make some other agreement with them?—Unless they can make some other agreement with them.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

913. Then if you did that you would do away with the diffieulty of taking 15 houses at a time?—Undoubtedly; the object of it is that you are to take 15 houses at a time so that you may replace the people displaeed in seetions.

Mr. *Torrens.*

914. You gave the Committee that distriet of Gray's Inn-road as an illustration of the unworkability of the 33rd section?—Yes.

915. Do you know how the people behind Gray's Inn-road, in the whole of that distriet called Baldwin's-gardens, earn their bread?—I take it that they are employed in the workshops in the neighbourhood, and in divers occupations. I should think many went a distanee to their work, but a great many I should think were employed in the loeality.

916. Do you know of any of them going a distanee to their work?—Not absolutely.

917. Would you be surprised to hear it stated as a notorious fact by those knowing the neighbourhood, that the mass of those populations earn their bread by handicraft trades?—Many of them do.

918. Trades like bakers and shoemakers and other ordinary occupations; they are very poor populations, I believe?—They are.

919. And it was found impraeticable to pull down a large section of Gray's Inn-road beeause there was a great difficulty in finding aecommodation for those people?—Yes; but I believe if they had had the opportunity of finding themselves accommodation they would have done so.

920. Is that belief founded upon any knowledge of their condition?—Of as densely populated districts; those whieh were cleared for the Law Courts; that population was quite as dense, and I should think by comparison very much the same sort of population, and yet they went and found places.

921. If you had followed them you would have found that many of them found their subsequent habitations in districts very near at hand?—I have not followed them.

922. These populations in Baldwin's-gardens and Gray's Inn-road were allowed to remain there, or a large portion of them, and are there still?—They are there still.

923. And a large portion of the houses have been allowed to go out of repair, and are now in ruins?—They are in a very bad state.

924. There are large gaps in Gray's Inn-road whieh are a disgraee to London at present?—Many sites have been purehased to prevent the leases of buildings being renewed.

925. And where fires have taken place the insurance may have been gathered, but it has not been applied in rebuilding those houses?—Looking to this Act being carried out, and the whole area cleared, there has been no outlay upon them.

926. Applying these facts to what you told the Committee a short time ago, may I ask where is the means of either tram or railway accommodation which would supply to that population if they were displaced and had a few pounds given them each to seek habitations whieh would enable them to earn their bread, especially at a distance?—You

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

—You can convey a vast number of people away by railway.

927. I do not make myself clear. I am talking of this specific population, and I want you to bring the case to a test. You stated that this case was an instance of what might be done, and, as I understood you, you thought that by giving them a few pounds compensation for dispossession they might easily find wholesome habitations elsewhere, at a distance where they might still earn their bread; do you know of your own knowledge that that population could be so transferred, and if so, tell me how?—From my experience of what has taken place elsewhere, particularly in the case of the Law Courts.

928. You would not say that the river accommodation would be any use to them?—No.

929. You would not say that the Great Western Railway would be any use to them?—I think it might.

930. From Baldwin's-gardens?—They can get from King's Cross to the Great Western Railway.

931. There are Hansom cabs too?—And there are trains almost anywhere; I know there are by the Great Western Railway, but it could not be done until there were cheap fares; still they would find accommodation, though possibly not in the wholesome state that you would desire, but as good as that or better than that which they leave.

932. Wholesome accommodation! yes, but my question is not only whether they could find wholesome accommodation, but could they find wholesome accommodation in which they, being at a distance, and with their habits and their only knowledge of industry, could earn their bread still; it would be no good to send them to the country if they could not earn their bread there?—The breadwinner would have to come to his work.

933. Do you know of your own knowledge that that population, speaking generally, who inhabit Baldwin's-gardens could afford to go by either one or, as you now suggest, two railways to the country, and come back into town to earn their bread?—With cheap fares, such as are established on the Great Eastern Railway, it could be done. A very few years ago you would find a man, a labourer, going to his work at six o'clock in the morning a long distance.

934. I am too ignorant to understand what "a man" means; "a man" may mean anything. I am speaking of a particular population and a particular class of people who live by a very stinted industry, and I ask where they could afford to live?—I think they would get cheaper accommodation elsewhere, and if there were these trains established at cheap fares, at a penny a journey, the time that they would save and the shoe-leather they would save, and the comfort that they would derive in not being exposed to all the inclemency of a winter's morning or bad weather would compensate them. I think it could be done. I think a great deal could be done for the amelioration of the working classes by those means. It is difficult to form an opinion upon the inhabitants of any particular locality; but looking at a similar one, when the Law Courts site was cleared, I remember the population there was as bad as that which exists now in Gray's Inn-road, and yet they went away.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

935. With reference to that Section 33 of the Metropolitan Streets Improvements Act, 1877, are you aware that it begins by a recital that it is expedient to provide "for the accommodation of such of the labouring classes as will be displaced by such removal," and then it goes on to show how that accommodation "as aforesaid," that is the accommodation of such of the labouring classes as would be displaced by removal should be provided; now, supposing that the Metropolitan Board of Works could make arrangements for a large portion of the labouring classes that would be displaced, moving away to other places, do you think that it is still necessary for them to let the land upon the condition that it must be covered by dwelling-houses or lodging-houses for persons of the labouring class?—I think it would take a very large proportion of the land that they have at their disposal to provide for the labouring classes.

936. You have suggested that a very large part of the labouring classes that are displaced by any scheme might by arrangement and, by being provided with a certain sum of money, settle elsewhere?—Yes.

937. If in one of these street improvements those arrangements have been made, and a large part of the labouring classes displaced by the removal is found lodging elsewhere, there would then be a comparatively small part of this area to be covered by these suitable dwelling-houses?—Very small indeed.

938. Then in that case if those arrangements could be made, there is no very strong objection to Section 33, is there?—If you could deal with it altogether there would not be; you must pull the buildings down to carry out the improvement.

939. You have arranged for a large part of the population of the working classes to settle themselves elsewhere, and then you would have a comparatively small part of the labouring classes to provide for?—Very small.

940. And further than that, it is not necessary that you should provide for them upon that area, because you may provide for them upon other lands if approved by the Secretary of State?—My impression is that you would have none to provide for if you gave them an opportunity of providing for themselves.

941. Then what is your objection to Section 33; because, if you provide for the labouring classes, this provision about letting upon condition of finding suitable dwelling-houses, does not apply?—But you are now bound to provide for them upon the same place.

942. No, indeed not; the Act expressly says in Section 33, "Provided always, that before the Board shall, without the consent of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, take, for the purposes of this Act, 15 houses or more, occupied at the time of the passing of this Act, either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes, as tenants or lodgers, the Board shall prove to the satisfaction of such Secretary of State that sufficient accommodation in suitable dwellings has been provided elsewhere upon the before-mentioned lands, or upon such other lands as may be approved by such Secretary of State"?—Yes, but then you are to deal with

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

it in sections, I take it, under that Act of Parliament. You must take down 15 houses at a time.

943. You may not take 15 houses down without having provided either upon that area, or upon some other area, accommodation for the persons displaced?—But you must deal with it in sections. First, you have to provide for the inhabitants of 15 houses, then you can pull those down under this Act, and then when you have done that you can take 15 more down; if you are under the Act you must provide for them on that particular site; that is the difficulty.

944. Surely the Act only says that you shall not take 15 houses down without having made provision; supposing that by such an arrangement as you suggest the labouring classes who were inhabiting 300 houses have been provided for, you may take down the 300 houses?—Does not the Act contemplate that you are to provide new dwellings for them?

945. The preamble of the 33rd section says that you are to make provision for the accommodation of such of the labouring classes as will be displaced by such removal; if you can show that sufficient accommodation and suitable building has been provided upon such other land as may be approved by the Secretary of State, you may take down the houses?—But you can only deal with 15 at a time.

946. Even if you have provided for the inhabitants of 40 or 50?—I think you must not turn them out in larger numbers than 15 houses at a time.

947. But if you make suitable arrangements elsewhere you do not turn them out?—I think that is not the spirit of the Act.

948. If you have made arrangements in any place approved by the Secretary of State for a certain number of inhabitants who would be displaced under the new scheme, you may proceed to your new scheme, may you not? The Act only says that you shall not take down 15 houses, unless you have provided other suitable accommodation, but it does not say that you may not take down 30 houses, or 50, or 100 houses, if you have provided accommodation?—It may be so.

Thursday, 16th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Mr. Hastings.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Holloud.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Torrens.
Sir Sydney Waterlow.

The Right Honourable Sir RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, in the Chair.

Mr. Samuel Walker, called in; and Examined.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

949. Are not you a surveyor in large practice in London?—Yes, I have had a considerable practice for the last 14 or 15 years in the City.

950. Have you had occasion to consider the terms of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwelling Improvement Act, both as a surveyor concerned for claimants, and as a witness on the part of the Board, in several cases of appeals from the final awards of arbitrators?—The terms of the Act have been brought under my notice in a large number of claims, which I have settled for claimants against the Board, and in giving evidence in jury cases as a witness for the Board after the final awards of the standing arbitrator.

951. You are an independent witness coming to the Board?—Yes.

952. And not belonging to the Board in any shape or form?—No.

953. Never having given them any advice?—Beyond being a witness in various cases settled before juries.

954. Being properly remunerated for coming and attending here?—Yes; I have acted against the Board in many cases, and in a good many cases for the Board.

955. You are in the position of taking an independent view of this subject?—Certainly.

956. On both sides?—Yes.

957. Do you consider that it will ever be possible, under the terms of the Artizans' Acts, to clear sites densely covered by unhealthy tenements except at a very great cost?—The cost must necessarily be very great, as the houses are so closely packed, with little or no yards, and the loss on clearing the site, and re-letting it after allowing for proper approaches, must be very heavy.

958. Will not that cost be augmented if the Board has to acquire sanitary property for the purpose of re-housing the labouring classes?—Certainly; the more sanitary the property the more expensive it will be; it often occurs that a fringe of sanitary property has to be acquired to complete the scheme, and provide proper access to it.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

959. Are the areas which have been acquired by the Board under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Acts, when cleared, better adapted in some cases for commercial purposes than for the erection of labourers' dwellings?—They would certainly realise a much larger rental if let for commercial purposes.

960. Will you admit that in some cases the land should be let for commercial purposes instead of re-housing artizans?—I do think so.

961. Do you consider that there would be much demand for sites for labourers' dwellings if the obligation is imposed on the lessee or purchaser, perpetually to dedicate such sites to artizans' or labourers' dwellings?—I do not think there would be.

962. Speaking generally, would you consider the price of 3*d.* a foot, obtained by the Board from the Peabody Trustees for sites to be dedicated to labourers' dwellings, as much as the Board could reasonably have expected to obtain under the conditions of the agreement?—I believe it was as much as could reasonably be expected, taking into account that it was a large sale, in fact, a wholesale transaction, if I may use the term; and bearing in mind the terms of the agreement and Lord Derby's letter, stating that that was their final offer, and that they were in treaty for other land; I should certainly not have advised the Board to decline the offer, had I been consulted.

963. Have you formed any opinion as to the means which should be taken to clear away such houses as are included in the artizans' areas, and can you suggest a way in which accommodation can be provided for the persons so displaced?—I would suggest that they should be compensated for their removal, leaving the tenants to suit themselves elsewhere; I think that public enterprise would soon find accommodation; and besides, there are a great number of houses in various localities, Peckham, Clapham, Wandsworth, and other places, that are standing empty for want of tenants.

964. You will put in a table of your experience in

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

in other cases, to show that this can be carried out; you will be able to do that presently?—I think so.

965. Do you think that without compulsory powers, a body like the Metropolitan Board of Works could acquire areas for the erection of labourers' dwellings?—No; property in London is so much subdivided by various freeholders, that it is impossible to buy a site of any size without compulsory powers.

966. Would it not be difficult to suggest where an open space of this kind could be obtained near the metropolis?—There are very few open spaces in or near the centre of the metropolis. I have recently advertised in the London and local district newspapers largely for artizans' sites, but with the result of only finding one suitable site.

967. If sites are cleared for the erection of labourers' dwellings, in order that the sites comprised in the artizans' area may be devoted to commercial purposes, would not the new sites often be occupied by labourers' dwellings, so that there would be an ultimate displacement of the labouring classes?—The evil would only be aggravated. The small houses are generally packed so close that it is very difficult to provide for the same number that are displaced.

968. Have you read the form of tender for letting the Whitechapel area before it was let to the Peabody Trustees; and do you consider it objectionable?—I have the two here.

969. The first one we will say; do you think either of them objectionable?—I do not think either of them objectionable.

970. Do you think that they are not too stringent?—No, I do not.

971. And you would have been prepared to advise a client to accept land upon those conditions?—The form of tender is very similar to the form upon which the Board have let land in Queen Victoria-street and Northumberland-avenue. I have made many tenders to the Board for land for clients, and I have never found a client to object to the clauses which the Board have inserted. The Whitechapel and Limehouse form of tender is altered to suit the altered circumstances of the land; but I do not think that the clauses are of such a stringent nature that it would prevent people building. I should be prepared to advise clients to build with those clauses, and I have clients who are building.

972. You have clients who are building?—I have, and I know people who are building.

973. On clauses not more stringent than these?—I think not more stringent than these.

974. Is it not the practice upon large building estates to put the lessees very much into the hands of the surveyor and architect of the owner; and does this practice interfere with the letting of the land?—It is the practice to put the lessee in the hands of the surveyor to the estate. The lessee is generally quite content to act under the lessor's surveyor, but especially so in the case of a public body, where the architect is a man of eminence and standing.

975. You have some table to put in by which you show how the various people were dealt with with regard to the Law Courts, have you not?—

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

Yes, I can speak as to what I did in settling with the tenants on the Law Courts' site.

Chairman.

976. How were you engaged on the Law Courts' site?—In the years 1865, 1866, and 1867 I was in Mr. George Pownall's office, the surveyor engaged by the First Commissioner of Works, and for him I settled all the weekly tenants' cases on the site for the new Law Courts.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

977. Can you give the number of people you settled with?—I can give the names and the number of the tenants. I removed 834 families.

978. Could you tell us how you arranged with them?—Yes, I can. The method adopted was as follows: A week's notice was given to about 40 persons, and at the end of the week they applied at the office on the site in New Boswell-court, at a stated time, and explained the nature of their holdings, trade, &c.; and sums varying from 1*l.* to 10*l.* were promised to them according to the length of their residence, and other circumstances.

979. Had the surveyor, according to his own discretion, the power to give 1*l.* or 10*l.*?—I had the discretion of giving what I pleased. Of course it was subject to Mr. Pownall and the First Commissioner, but whatever I thought reasonable and right I gave. They had then another week to seek for a new abode and move out. At the end of the week's time they called at the office with the key, and took their money and signed a receipt. It was a very rare thing for a longer time to be asked for by anybody; and this method was adopted from week to week until the site was cleared. Mr. Pownall has kindly allowed me to refer to the records kept, and I find that in nearly every case the tenants went out at the time arranged. The amount paid was 3,249*l.*, to 834 families.

980. Had you any complaint from these weekly tenants, after they had received the money, about not being able to find where to go to?—No. In proof of that, I find that 304 families were removed in one month, the month of August 1866.

981. In one month 304 families were removed?—Yes.

982. Without any complaint whatever?—No; they all found residences. I will give you one or two instances. For instance, on the 30th July 1866, I settled 40 claims; they all removed according to the agreement; 38 removed on the 6th August; one woman asked to remain till the 13th August, and one woman until the 17th of August, and they all went out at the time agreed. Then on the 6th August 1866, I settled 34 claims, and they all removed, according to agreement, on the 14th of August. On the 9th of August I settled 86 claims; 79 removed on the 16th, and four went out on the 23rd. On the 16th of August I settled 32 claims; 30 of them removed on the 23rd August, and one on the 29th September. Of course, now and then a little time was asked, but in nearly every case they went out at the time specified.

983. Those are all cases which came under your own practical knowledge?—I settled them all.

984. Can

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

984. Can you tell the Committee at all where those various families went to?—I did not keep a record of it, but I asked many of the people where they went to, and I was told that some went to Clapham Junction, some to Battersea, some to Southwark, and some to Bedfordbury; they generally dispersed all over the metropolis.

985. Have you any record of the trades of those various persons who were displaced?—Yes; since last Monday I looked through the list of people who were turned out in one day, and I will read you a list of the trades which those various people occupied.

986. Can you give the date?—I can, by and by, on reference to the papers. A bootmaker, a plasterer, a tailor, a dressmaker, a lastmaker, a bookbinder, a musical instrument maker, a printer, a porter, a cook, a carpenter, a compositor, an undertaker's driver, a law writer, a journeyman baker, a shirtmaker, a brushmaker, a bricklayer, a carman, a cabinet-maker, a fish hawker, a painter, and a jeweller.

987. That represents a good many trades in the metropolis?—Yes, that represents the trades of the various persons removed in one day.

988. And they, without the slightest difficulty, found accommodation elsewhere in the metropolis, and received compensation without any grumbling at all?—They did.

989. Was it one of each trade?—No, one of one trade and two or three of another.

990. Those are the various trades?—Yes.

991. Have you anything more to say upon that point, which you think the Committee would like to hear, with regard to the Law Courts?—No; except this, that a question was asked of Mr. Reid on Monday, as to the occupation of the tenants in Baldwin's-gardens, Gray's Inn. I have lately had to sell some freehold property in Tyndall's-buildings and Baldwin's-gardens to the Board, and since Monday I have sent down there and ascertained the names of the tenants in Baldwin's-gardens and Tyndall's-buildings, and their occupations, and where they are employed; and of a list of 106 tenants I find that more than half are employed in various localities. I will read a few of them. In No. 35, Baldwin's-gardens, John Reid lives on the first floor; he is a drover engaged in various localities, and he has been in occupation three weeks. The next man is L. Poli, an Italian; he is a plaster-cast maker, and works in the locality; he has been there six years. The next is F. Webster, a shoemaker; he works in Old-street, St. Luke's; he has been in occupation 16 weeks. The next is F. J. Weedon, a chairmaker; he works in Bethnal Green, and has been in occupation six weeks. The next is Thomas Hurran, living at 37, Baldwin's-gardens; he is a French polisher, and works in the Gray's Inn-road; he has been in occupation nine years. The next is J. Murphy, a marble polisher, working in Hoxton; has been in occupation three years.

992. Have you anything more to say to the Committee as to the Law Courts?—No.

993. Can you give any information to the Committee as to the mode adopted when the School Board wished their sites cleared; how do they dispose of the weekly tenants, the poorer

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

people?—Some years ago the surveyor for the School Board was laid up through illness, and I assisted the Board. I purchased many of their sites; and the practice which the School Board adopts is to give the people a week's or a fortnight's notice, and then to give them 1 *l.*, or 2 *l.*, or 3 *l.*, as the surveyor thinks fit; and the surveyor has a discretionary power to go up to 10 *l.* without applying to the committee. If it is more than 10 *l.*, he takes the opinion of the committee.

994. Can you give the Committee any idea of how many artizans were displaced?—I cannot tell you that; my knowledge is not sufficiently great.

995. Then your experience is that none of these people complained?—No, they went out very readily indeed.

996. And they all found habitations to suit them?—Yes, they suited themselves.

997. Have you anything more to say about your experience of the School Board?—No, not as to the re-housing of the people.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

998. I understood you to say that 40 persons were served with notices in one week; I thought you meant that that was the limit?—No, I served notice on as many as I could conveniently take in a day. Sometimes I did not serve notice on so many as 40; it depended on the number of houses that we wanted to clear at one time, but 40 was about the average number.

999. Then you meant that in a month there would be four times 40 removed?—Yes; sometimes I used to work at it twice a week, Mondays and Thursdays.

1000. I think you said you removed 304 families in one month?—Yes.

1001. What is the greatest number that you removed in a month?—That was certainly the most. I compensated about 300 or 400, and then gave them a rest. There was no necessity to turn them all out in three or four months; it was not so important that the site should be cleared so quickly, and we gave them a rest and thought they would suit themselves elsewhere, by not hurrying the thing too much.

1002. The 304 families would comprise, I suppose, about 1,500 persons?—Giving four to five to a family.

1003. Between 1,200 and 1,500?—Yes.

1004. And you think that a displacement of that kind is not excessive, and that people can find lodgings elsewhere?—I think if it went on month by month, and year by year, it would be excessive, if it was constantly going on at that rate.

1005. How long did it take you to remove the whole 834 families?—I see that I commenced paying them on the 1st of August, and by the 30th of August I had compensated 304. In September I do not think any were turned out. In October 1866, there were 155 removed. In November there were very few, about eight or ten; and in December there were about 40, and so it went on. In the following February 1867, I should think there

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

would be 168. In March 1867, there were 215 families removed.

1006. Then at what period did the removals cease, it began in August 1866?—It began in August 1866; practically 12 months, but the bulk were removed in six months. In the last six months there were very few to remove.

1007. Did you come across any of these tenants after they had been removed?—No, I think not. I do not remember meeting them where I was concerned for other public bodies.

1008. But you never heard any complaint of hardship?—No, they were all satisfied; they were glad to take the money.

1009. They considered that they were fairly treated?—They were very well satisfied.

1010. You spoke in the early part of your evidence as having advertised for artizans' sites?—Yes.

1011. For what purpose was that?—I advertised for the Board of Works.

1012. Where were the sites to be; within what area?—Within three miles of St. Paul's.

1013. And you got no replies?—I got some replies; but the sites offered were either too small, or the prices were extravagantly high.

1014. At what date did you advertise?—Quite recently; I think six weeks or two months ago.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1015. Are you sure it was not a little earlier than that?—The advertisements may have been a little earlier, perhaps two months, but the advertisements were running some weeks.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1016. If the area that you were asked to advertise for had been placed, say five miles instead of three miles of St. Paul's, would you have had a great difficulty in finding sites?—No. I think there are plenty of sites within five miles of St. Paul's; but you come into suburban land, within a radius of five miles from St. Paul's, you would get to Battersea and Clapham; you would get into grass land.

1017. Do you think that if proper means of transit were provided, there would be any hardship in sending the artizans and labourers as far as five miles from the heart of the metropolis?—No, I think not; I think the railway companies should be compelled to carry the people at proper workmen's fares, the same as the Great Eastern Company have done.

1018. Do you think that the rent of the houses in the suburban sites would be much cheaper than those in the metropolis?—Yes; the rent of houses in the suburbs, for poor people, is much cheaper, taking accommodation for accommodation.

1019. And I presume quite as healthy, at any rate?—More healthy.

1020. In your opinion, are there a great many houses at the present time, in and about London, standing empty?—I never remember so many empty houses in the suburbs of London as there are now, especially for working class people; there are an enormous number of houses empty at Tottenham, Stamford Hill, Peckham, Battersea, and Wandsworth, and the south-west district, houses specially built for the working

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

classes, six-roomed cottages, letting at 9*s.* and 10*s.* per week.

1021. What is the cause of that?—Over speculation in the building trade.

1022. Then that being the case, if families were removed from the centre of the metropolis, there would be no difficulty in their finding dwellings further out?—Certainly not; there is plenty of room for them.

1023. You say that you gave them sums varying from 1 *l.* to 10 *l.*; can you say about what was the average?—The average would be 4 *l.*, or within a fraction of it; they mostly had 2 *l.*; very few had less than 2 *l.*, but I see on a page with 16 tenants, one tenant had 7 *l.*, one had 4 *l.*, and all the rest had 2 *l.*; the greatest number would receive 2 *l.*

1024. In giving them these amounts, did you take into consideration the convenience of the site for their trade, or the length of time they had occupied the premises?—I took every circumstance into account, their trade, and the time that they had lived on the premises; but where they had trades, I gave them more; for instance, here is a gold-lace weaver, he had 12 *l.*, I see, and the people who had 2 *l.* and 3 *l.* were mostly lodgers, and were not traders.

1025. I think you said, in answer to a former question, that you received no complaint of hardship at their being turned out and remunerated in this way?—No; they were very well satisfied.

Mr. *Cropper.*

1026. Did you deal individually with these tenants yourself?—I did.

1027. Did you visit them in their homes?—No, I did not go to their homes; I had an office fitted up in one of the houses in New Boswell-court, bought by the Government, and used it as an office; and when they had notice they came to me.

1028. Did you find how many years' residence these people had had; we have had some curious evidence about it?—Yes, I asked most of them how long they had been there, and some had been there a short time, and some a very long while. In looking through the book the other night, I found one man had lived 50 years in the parish; another one had lived 48 years in the parish, and the next one six weeks.

1029. But they did not seem to care about going when you put the 2 *l.* or 3 *l.* in their way?—They found accommodation.

1030. I think you said that you had not traced them at all afterwards?—I did not keep a record of where they went to.

1031. You say that many of them went into Peabody's Buildings or Sir Sydney Waterlow's dwellings?—At that time the Peabody Buildings were not erected. This was in 1866.

1032. Have you known anything of the private sales of property in those bad districts?—Yes, they come across me sometimes in my business as a surveyor.

1033. What sort of number of years' purchase have you thought yourself to be the ordinary trade purchase?—These freeholds in these narrow streets and alleys did not fetch more than 10 years' purchase.

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

1034. You would say that from your knowledge of the subject?—Yes.

1035. I think you said that there was just now an ample supply of buildings of all kinds for the working classes?—Yes, in the outer ring.

1036. And within reach of these trade places where these men are occupied?—Yes.

1037. What do you mean by the "outer ring"?—Camberwell, Peckham, and Nine Elms, Kentish-town and Somers'-town, there are houses for their accommodation in all those districts.

1038. Can you say whether many people who were displaced went to the outside to their places of work, or whether their places of work are chiefly in the centre, and the people come into them?—Many of the people on the Law Courts' sites, and on most of the sites that have been bought, are labourers and builders' workmen, and they have to shift their work as their employer takes a contract in various parts of London; and many of these men would shift of their own accord, or if they did not shift, they would have to walk a considerable distance to their work. For instance, a workman living in Gray's Inn-road may have a job at King's Cross for three months, the next job may be at Blaekfriars or Camberwell.

1039. But I watched the list of trades that you gave, and they were mostly stationary trades?—They are all sorts of trades.

1040. But mostly trades which are stationary trades, builders' labourers, and those sort of people have to march out to where the buildings are going on at?—At Baldwin's-gardens and Tyndall's-buildings there are many Irish tenants, many of them are labourers, and many of them go hop-picking in the summer time.

1041. You think it does not matter to those people much what part of London they live in?—No, I do not think it does.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1042. I understand you to say that about half these tenants were employed in the neighbourhood, and one-half at a distance?—I make it 41 in the number of 106 tenants; 41 employed in the locality, and 65 employed in various localities. In saying various localities, I include such men as organ-grinders, and street-hawkers, and men of that class.

1043. By "various localities," you mean men employed generally at a distance?—Their work is not dependent on the immediate locality.

1044. Then it could only be a hardship in the case of the 41 locally employed?—Yes, a hardship in the case of two-fifths.

1045. Judging from the amount of compensation you gave, we may conclude that a very large portion of them had been there but a short time, on the Law Courts' site. Could you give any average of their tenancy?—I can read you a page. Here is a cabman who had been in occupation four years; the next tenant, a labourer, two years; the next tenant seven years; the next tenant two years; the next tenant four years; the next tenant three years; the next tenant three years; the next tenant 10

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

weeks; the next tenant three years; the next tenant 15 months, and the next one 1 month.

1046. Had they before that, come from another part of the metropolis, or had they been resident in the district?—I cannot say where they had previously been.

1047. What sort of lodgings were they occupying on the Law Courts' site?—The houses were very similar to the houses in Newport-market, and the back of Soho; it was a very poor locality.

1048. Families generally occupying one room or more?—The houses were let out each room to a tenant mostly.

1049. What were they paying?—They paid 2 *s.* 6 *d.* to 3 *s.* a room; where they had two rooms they paid 5 *s.*

1050. By going to a distance, would they probably get more than one room?—If they went into the suburbs, they would have to take two rooms, I should think.

1051. They would be compelled to take two rooms?—I should think they would; in the outskirts of London, certainly, they would.

1052. Would they have them at the same rent, or a less rent?—They would get two rooms pretty nearly for the price of one. An ordinary six-roomed house in the suburbs of London will let for 10 *s.* or 11 *s.* a week, and these houses in the close localities generally fetch 3 *s.* or 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a room.

1053. Therefore, in respect of decency, these families will benefit rather by the change?—Yes.

Chairman.

1054. You say that the property on this Law Courts' site would have sold to the public for about 10 years' purchase?—That, and other property of a similar character in the market, would be worth about ten years' purchase.

1055. The freehold?—Yes, on the net rental.

1056. That is on the rental which is paid to the freeholder?—On the rental which the freeholder receives, the net rental.

1057. Then the middle man is the man who very often makes a great profit, is he not?—Certainly, the middle man very often makes a very large profit, considering what he does.

1058. What would the middle man's interest sell for, if he had a lease of this property; the middle men take leases sometimes, do they not?—The middle men generally take a lease of one, or two, or more houses, and then farm them out, letting them to these poor weekly tenants.

1059. What kind of lease do they take; what length of lease?—It varies. With the city companies and public bodies who have this class of property, they generally let it out on a lease of 40 years, with strong clauses that the lessee shall keep it in order; but private individuals generally let these houses out on a 21 years' lease, and then the covenants are not so well looked after.

1060. Take one of the private places with a 21 years' lease; what sort of value would that middle man get for his interest if he sold it?—It is very difficult to say. These sort of leases hardly ever come into the market; they are worth very little money between buyer and seller at the auction mart.

 1061. Supposing

Chairman—continued.

1061. Supposing that you wanted to get hold of a freehold, and you bought the freehold, and gave 10 years' purchase for it, and then you wanted to get rid of the middle man, how much would you have to pay him?—I should ascertain the net rent that he would receive, and of course deduct the rent that he paid, and the difference would be the net rental.

1062. And you would take into consideration the number of years?—Yes, he would be entitled to receive compensation possibly on the 10 per cent. table; but when I say "10 years' purchase for the freehold," I mean 10 years' purchase, not let to a middle man, but let to a yearly tenant.

1063. In the case of the middle man you would have more to pay?—Yes, in the case of a middle man you would have more to pay; wherever you have a middle man you have more to pay for the house.

1064. He is a man who makes money out of the bad places?—Yes.

1065 Have you looked into any of the awards that have been made under the Act of 1875 in London, in the case of artizans' dwellings?—Yes.

1066. Speaking from your experience, are you satisfied with the results of the awards as a whole?—As a whole, I think I am. I was engaged by the Board in the case of Bennett's trustees, which was a very large case, and I gave evidence for the Board in that case. The award there, I think, was reduced by the jury by some 2,000 *l.*, but I think the blot in the Act, if I may so say, is, that sufficient consideration is not given for the very dilapidated state in which the premises are.

1067. Will you look at the Act of 1875. The words are: "Take into consideration the then state of the property," or words to that effect?—Yes, I think it is Clause 3; I think that the juries have not taken that sufficiently into account.

1068. Clause 19 is the one I am referring to, sub-section 2: "Whenever the compensation payable in respect of any lands, or of any interests in any lands proposed to be taken compulsorily in pursuance of this Act, requires to be assessed, the estimate of the value of such lands or interests shall be based upon the fair market value as estimated at the time of the valuation being made of such lands and of the several interests in such lands, due regard being had to the nature and then condition of the property." Can you suggest any way of strengthening those words; you agree with the principle of the clause?—I agree with the principle of the clause.

1069. Do you think that the arbitrators, in working out that particular clause, have acted up entirely to the spirit of it, or have they given too much?—I think if they have erred at all they have erred upon the side of giving too much; they have not taken into account sufficiently the state of repair.

1070. You are a practical surveyor; could you suggest any words which you would send to us that would strengthen that clause, in order to compel the arbitrator to do what we all want him to do?—I will do so.

1071. Now, will you look at the Act of 1879, chapter 63, clause 3. Just read it over first, and I will ask you a question upon it; it goes a good deal further than the old Act?—Yes, it does.

Chairman—continued.

1072. And probably when you send in your Paper, you will consider that clause as well, as to whether it should go further than it does?—I will.

1073. Now, of course, when you were engaged about the Law Courts, your object was to get rid of these people, and get possession of the land as cheaply as possible, not doing anything that you thought an injustice?—Certainly.

1074. But I do not presume that you mean to say, for a moment, that it would be wise to make a very large clearance all over the centre of London, and drive everybody out?—No, certainly not.

1075. In dealing with these people, there are certain classes, at all events, for whom it is almost necessary that they should be in the neighbourhood of their work?—Many of them are dependent upon the locality.

1076. Take a case like that of the costermongers, who must be near their markets; is it not also the case, that in the centre of London, it is not solely the breadwinner of the family who earns the whole wages, but the other members of the family are able to get employment?—Yes, very often the wife is a charwoman, or laundress, and sometimes the children work.

1077. They would not be able to do so to the same extent in the suburbs?—No, they would not.

1078. Is there not another matter to be taken into consideration; that is, that those persons very often, especially on Saturday nights, get very cheap food by the sweeping up of the markets?—Yes; they get cheap food by going to the markets, but there are so many markets in London.

1079. It would not be the same in the suburbs?—There are a great many markets in the suburbs, not markets in the strict sense of the term, but there are a congregation of poor shops in High-street, Peckham; that is practically a market on Saturday nights; and the New Cut is a market, just the same as Smithfield is a market, though it is not called a market.

1080. It is the fact that in these great markets in London a vast quantity of food is sold very cheap, in order to clear the place at night?—Yes.

1081. And that is a great advantage to these people, is it not?—No doubt.

Mr. *Cropper.*

1082. Is not every large shop that sells food, even in the best streets all over the suburbs, a cheap market on a Saturday night; do you know that. Take the large fish shops, and all the large meat shops, if you go in after the people have finished buying on a Saturday night, you will find that what is left is sold for a comparatively small sum?—I believe that custom does obtain with some tradesmen, but it is not general.

Chairman.

1083. That does not affect what I am asking you about, which is, that there are these very large

Chairman—continued.

large markets, and there must remain these very large markets in the centre of London, at which an enormous amount of food is sold to the poor people cheap on Saturday nights, which they would not get if they lived in the suburbs?—That is true, but the markets are scattered over the metropolis.

1084. There are these markets which they would not reach unless they came specially for purpose from the suburbs?—That is so.

1085. If you could simply buy the property and sell it all for commercial purposes, you would save a great deal of money?—No doubt there would be a great saving.

1086. And if you, as a surveyor, were called on by the Metropolitan Board of Works, you would, if you possibly could, advise that such a course should be taken?—Yes; if the Board could sell the sites coloured blue upon the plan, for commercial purposes, I should say, roughly, that they would get six times the price that they would if it were used for artizans' dwellings.

1087. You said just now that you advertised for places for working men's dwellings?—I advertised for sites.

1088. Was that a wise way, do you think, to go about it?—I think so. I did not advertise in the name of the Board; I advertised for people to send particulars to me at my office. The public did not know for whom I was asking.

1089. I understood you to say that it was impossible, without compulsory powers, to buy sites for these purposes?—Yes, where there are houses.

1090. How is it that Sir Sydney Waterlow's company, and a great many other companies, have been able to buy land for this purpose at reasonable rates and in very suitable places?—I think they have absorbed all that there is; I do not know of any sites now.

1091. But they are still going on buying, are they not?—I know of no sites in London in closely packed neighbourhoods.

1092. Do not you think that if you went about it carefully, you could, within three miles of St. Paul's, buy sites fit for artizans' dwellings?—I think not, without compulsory powers, unless the Board pay a very long price and make an enormous sacrifice. A site was offered in the Euston-road, and the price asked was half-a-crown a foot, and the Board would get about 4*d.* for letting it.

1093. In your opinion, none of these companies will be able, for the next few years, at all events, to buy any sites within three miles of St. Paul's?—I cannot say that. My advertisements may not have reached everybody who has land to let.

1094. But, as far as your opinion goes, that is the case?—Yes; there is very little land to let within three miles of St. Paul's.

1095. Have you gone into the question as to what it would pay a company to buy it at for these purposes?—It depends a good deal upon the situation. In the centre of London, where labour is valuable, they could fully afford 4 *d.*, and in poor localities, 3 *d.* and 2 *d.*

1096. You think that the value of artizans' houses, when built in the centre of London, would

Chairman—continued.

be greater than when built in the suburbs?—Most decidedly.

1097. Upon what do you found that opinion?—Because the men are nearer to their work, and there is more demand for them.

1098. There is more demand, and the people would like it better?—There is more demand, and the people would like it better; and no doubt, the nearer a man could be to his work, the better it would be for him.

1099. If you were advising the men themselves, you would advise them, if they could, to get accommodation near their place of work?—Yes.

1100. You would not advise them to go to Peckham or Camberwell?—There are advantages both ways; a man with his family can do as well at Peckham as elsewhere.

1101. We may take it as a matter of fact, may we not, that if their homes are near their work, the men like it better for some reason or other?—I should think so.

1102. You have been talking about the site that was cleared for the new Law Courts?—Yes.

1103. But, as I understand you, you have made no inquiry at all as to the result of this clearance, so far as the people are concerned?—No, it was not part of my duty, and I did not ask where they had gone to, except now and then, casually.

1104. You have not traced them?—No; it is too long ago.

1105. And you had no reason to do so?—No.

1106. All you wanted to do was to get them away as quietly as you could?—That was all.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1107. You said that if the Board could sell its sites for commercial purposes, it would get six times the amount it is likely to get for them if they are sold for artizans' dwellings?—Yes, generally speaking.

1108. Could a portion of that difference be saved by the Board, by selling the frontages for commercial purposes, leaving the sites behind, in less good positions, to be used for artizans' dwellings?—When I said "six times," I was referring to the part coloured blue upon the plan, the back portions of the site, not the whole.

1109. You were only alluding to the better parts of the sites?—To the inferior portion of the sites, the back part.

1110. Do you think that two-fifths is about the average proportion of the occupants of the houses, who are employed locally?—I should not think that it would be any more than two-fifths.

1111. Do you think that the district cleared for the Law Courts would, on the whole, represent the fair average of other districts?—Yes.

1112. You would expect to find in that district as many men employed locally as in other parts?—Yes; there were a good many printers there, and stationers, and law writers.

Chairman.

1113. Then, I suppose, that what would meet your views upon this point would be this, that, instead of the Act requiring that there should be houses built for as many of the labouring population as were sent away, you would like the Act

Chairman—continued.

modified, so that there should be accommodation provided for two-fifths of that amount?—Certainly, for not more than two-fifths; that would amply meet the case.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1114. That would meet any local demand?—Yes.

1115. And beyond that, there would be no particular reason for supplying accommodation there?—No.

Chairman.

1116. Then, if that is so, probably you would like to see this also added to the Act, that care should be taken that these buildings should be built as early as possible?—Certainly.

1117. You would have compulsory powers to that effect?—Yes.

1118. And you would not object to the Metropolitan Board of Works having power to put them up themselves?—I think that the sites should be first offered to the public companies, either by auction or by tender, and if no one came forward, then the Board should have power to build.

1119. And if the public companies did not accept them, would you make it compulsory upon the Board to build?—I think the Board, in their own interests, would build, because they are losing hundreds of thousands of pounds by the stoppage of their street improvements.

1120. And that being so, you would not object to making it compulsory?—No.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1121. Would you like to put the Metropolitan Board, a large public body, in competition with private enterprise?—No, I think not; if the Metropolitan Board of Works did build upon the sites they acquired, the other public institutions would immediately stop their work, because they could not compete with the Board, which gets its money at 3 per cent., whereas the other public bodies pay 5 per cent.

1122. That is the effect of the evidence given by Mr. Gatliffe last year?—Yes; they would of necessity shut up their doors.

1123. And I think that even the action of the Peabody Trustees has tended towards that result in reference to Mr. Gatliffe's and other undertakings of the same kind?—Yes; very much so.

1124. Have you anything else with reference to the conditions of the 1875 and 1879 Acts, which you would like to say to the Committee, which you have not already said?—I should like to correct one answer which I made. I ought to have said with reference the price of the freeholds on these sites, that I think the number of years' purchase for the net rental of the freeholds would be 14 or 15 years' purchase for the freehold, and 10 years, or at the rate of 10 per cent. for the leasehold.

1125. You want to correct it from 14 to 15, and not 10?—Yes; but upon the 10 per cent. table for the leasehold.

1126. As to the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act of 1872, have you considered the terms of

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

that Act with reference to certain plots of land therein allocated as sites for the labouring classes?—I have.

1127. Do you think that there would be much demand for sites if they were perpetually dedicated to the labouring classes?—No; I do not think that speculators or builders would apply; the principal applications would be from Model Lodging House Companies; the dedication for a special purpose must reduce the number of applicants.

1128. And that has been the case under the Act?—Yes, it has, in my experience.

1129. Do you think that the terms of Section 49 of the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act, 1872, under which the Board has power to let, are calculated to deter persons from making tenders?—I do, most decidedly; the arbitration clause is most objectionable.

1130. Apart, however, from any difficulty in the form of tender, would the obligation to perpetually dedicate the land to the working classes greatly diminish its value in the market?—Certainly it would; I should say, generally it would be as I stated before.

1131. Leaving that, and referring to the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act, 1877, have you considered the effect of the 33rd section?—I have.

1132. Do you think it practicable for the Board to carry out its Western-street improvements, the Gray's Inn-lane improvements, and the improvements on the other side of the water, as authorised, subject to those conditions?—It is practically impossible; there are no sites within a reasonable distance to be obtained, and until land is cleared the streets cannot be started.

1133. You say it is impossible for the Metropolitan Board of Works to carry out the provisions, unless the 33rd section is either abolished or modified?—It is impossible for the Metropolitan Board of Works to carry out the provisions, unless that section is repealed or very much modified.

1134. Please to state the practical objections which apply to this?—The great difficulty is in the Board finding new houses for the people displaced within a moderate or reasonable distance. As the case now stands, they cannot be moved, as there is no accommodation close by, and pulling down adjoining houses and rebuilding, would only aggravate the evil.

1135. Have you looked at the improvement of Gray's Inn-lane lately?—Yes, I have looked at it many times.

1136. I think you have something to tell us about that?—I think I have already answered that.

1137. It is in a very terrible state now, is it not; part of the freeholds have been bought, and the others, which are subject to the 33rd section, are left there, and the whole place is in a very disgraceful state?—Yes, the Board have houses and shops empty, and they cannot pull them down.

1138. The Metropolitan Board of Works are absolutely powerless in every shape and form?—Their hands are absolutely tied.

1139. How

Mr. *Croppper.*

1139. How long have the houses been empty?—I cannot say.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1140. What do you suggest as the best way of dealing with the labouring classes displaced in the execution of street improvements?—I should deal with them as I did on Law Courts' site, give them a sum of money, and let them suit themselves elsewhere.

1141. You would apply to the street improvements the same policy, from your own experience, as was followed in the case of the Law Courts?—I should.

1142. Do you think that the Metropolitan Board of Works were right in hesitating to proceed with the Western-street Improvements, and the Gray's Inn-lane, and other improvements, owing to the stringency of the 38rd section?—Most certainly I do.

1143. Can you make any practical suggestion as to the questions which are referred to this Committee by Parliament, beyond what I have asked you?—I will consider the two sections which Sir Richard Cross has asked me to consider, and then I will bring the result.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1144. You said that the Board could not find new houses for the artizans who were displaced?—Yes.

1145. But I think the tendency of your other evidence is in the direction that there is plenty of accommodation?—There is plenty of accommodation, and the people find it themselves very much better then the Board; they suit themselves, they suit their own convenience, and if the Board had the ordinary railway clause, which we have heard of, the people would be satisfied with it, and suit themselves.

1146. You mean the ordinary railway clause, that people must be provided for, unless otherwise dealt with?—Yes.

1147. Supposing that were introduced into Section 33, you think it would meet the difficulty?—I do.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1148. I only wish to ask you one question, as a matter of opinion; in your opinion are there a great many areas in London still requiring to be dealt with on account of their imperfect sanitary arrangements?—Yes, there are a good many areas in London which are quite insanitary, and ought to be dealt with.

1149. You could not, I suppose, give me any idea as to the number of persons living in those areas?—No, they are mostly closely packed with inhabitants, and I think the parishes do not do their duty. I do not think they exercise sufficient sanitary inspection over the houses; if they had, the necessity for this Act, I think, would not have arisen.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1150. You say there are no sites near the Gray's Inn-road which might be used for the purpose of providing accommodation to those who are dispossessed?—Not at a reasonable price.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

1151. What does that mean. First of all, is it the fact that there are vacant sites?—There is land in Farringdon-road; I applied to the Corporation of London, to the officer who has the letting of that land, but I found the price was quite prohibitory; it would have been an enormous loss to have taken the land, and to have built artizans' dwellings upon it.

1152. But much nearer than Farringdon-road; at a right angle with Gray's Inn-road itself, are there no sites vacant?—That site was cleared by the Board.

1153. And being in their own hands, you say it is not available; I speak of the Clerkenwell-road property, which is in possession of the Board?—There is a large site opposite the Sessions House and Farringdon-road.

1154. And further down?—And towards Old-street.

1155. Below Reid's Brewery?—Yes.

1156. There is enough there to build how much; you are a better judge than I am?—There is space enough for several hundreds of families.

1157. And that is within pistol shot of the locality we are talking of?—Yes, within half-a-mile.

1158. How can you explain your statement that there are no sites?—I meant sites foreign to the Board, not the Board's sites.

1159. If the difficulty of the Board is to find accommodation for the people whom you think it ought to dispossess, in order to carry out the Act, is it not the first and obvious alternative, to use the land which is in possession of the Board, without going to Farringdon-road?—Of course these sites could be used for dwellings, but the loss would be enormous. These sites are fitted for commercial purposes.

1160. I do not ask whether the frontage should be used for that purpose, but there are such spaces. What is the space between the frontage opposite Reid's Brewery, and the next occupancy, or dwelling-house in the next street behind; is it a narrow street, or what is the acreage?—I do not think there is much area there; there is a large area lower down, in Farringdon-road.

1161. I do not speak of Farringdon-road; I speak of the property that has come into the possession of the Board of Works. Are there not from Southampton-row, which is, perhaps, one-third of a mile to the other side of Gray's Inn-road, and on to Reid's Brewery, and on from that down to Farringdon-road, nearly three-quarters of a mile, large spaces of frontage unoccupied, and with accommodation, which might be built upon for the purposes which we are considering?—The only really large space that I remember is the site in the new street opposite the Sessions House.

1162. You, perhaps, have not been there lately; your memory is perhaps inaccurate as to that, but if I state to you from recent observation within the last 48 hours, that there are large sites lying vacant all in possession of the Board of Works, would you give me any reason why they should not be, as far as they go, occupied for the purpose of providing that which the Act of Parliament declares ought to be provided, in order that Gray's Inn-road may be redeemed

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

from ruin?—If artizans' dwellings are built on those sites it will be a tremendous loss.

1163. In what way?—Because the land is so much more valuable for commercial purposes.

1164. For frontage?—Yes.

1165. But not the whole space behind them?—That land is available for manufacturing purposes, and the parties who take it would want a great depth for their purposes; the ordinary depth of 40 or 50 feet would be of no use; it is a question of cost.

1166. It is a question of cost merely?—Yes.

1167. And the only question you think to be considered by the Board of Works, is how the land may be made most available for manufacturing purposes, to increase the value of the property. You think that is its duty, and it should confine its attention to that?—I can hardly go so far as that.

1168. How much further would you go, because that is what I want to arrive at; are the people worth nothing at all?—Yes, certainly.

1169. How much are they worth?—I can scarcely answer that.

1170. I should like an answer, because that is what we are here to decide. The Act of Parliament says one thing, and you say the duty of the Board of Works is something else; I do not want to press you, but I want to know which you would have had us do. Should we repeal the Act to make the property more valuable for commercial purposes, or is there a balance to be struck between the people and the property?—I would repeal the 33rd section of the Act, as regards artizans' dwellings, but not the Artizans' Dwellings Act.

1171. Which Artizans' Dwellings Act?—The Artizans' Dwellings Act for rehousing the people.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

Whenever the land was brought under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, it should be appropriated for artizans' dwellings, but I hardly think it is necessary in the Streets Improvement Act.

1172. Do you mean Sir Richard Cross's Act?—Yes.

Chairman.

1173. You would still keep that land for the artizans?—Yes, that land, but not land under the Streets Improvement Act.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1174. You have told the Right honourable Chairman that you thought providing two-fifths would be enough accommodation where the district is cleared?—That was the experience I found in Gray's Inn-road.

1175. What experience?—At the last meeting of the Committee, you asked Mr. Reid whether he was aware that most of the people in the locality had their occupations in the immediate vicinity, and since the meeting of the Committee, I have sent down to Baldwin's-gardens, and ascertained the names of the tenants, and where they work.

1176. That is, the remaining tenants?—There are none turned out in Baldwin's-gardens, the houses are still occupied, and I find that out of 106 tenants, 41 work in the locality, and 65 work in various outside neighbourhoods.

1177. When you say "outside neighbourhoods," do you mean at a distance?—At a distance.

1178. Not in the vicinity?—No; they work at Old-street, Bethnal-green, Hoxton, Cheapside, and other localities away.

The Rev. Canon GILBERT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1179. WHAT part of London are you most acquainted with?—Personally, I am most acquainted with the City and the borders of the City; but I am also intimately acquainted, from my official position, from overlooking certain parishes, with the Spitalfields district and the Tower Hill district.

1180. Then you must know a great many of the most crowded parts of London?—I do.

1181. And the kind of people that inhabit them?—Yes. In the City I have seen, by railway improvements, by the City improvements, and partly by the Metropolitan improvements on the borders of the City, the whole neighbourhood destroyed, and the centres of business entirely ruined. I remember within the last 10 years, in my own district, which comprises the City and the borders of the City, that no less than 6,000 of the poorer classes have been swept completely away, and the result has been that Petticoat-lane, which may be known to many of you, and Cutler-street, and Harrow-alley, where upon week days you could not get through from the business, are now empty, and

Chairman—continued.

the business has now all gone away. That is, as I have said, in my own district.

1182. What we want to know is this: we are discussing the principle of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1875, which you know?—Yes; I have read it.

1183. And we want your opinion as to how far, looking at the character of the people, and the nature of their occupations, it might be safe to relax the provisions of that Act, which require that there shall be accommodation found for the working classes, for as many at least as those who are displaced; and we want to know what effect, in your opinion, the Act would have if that provision was done away with, or if it was much modified?—I do not think that it ought to be much modified; it ought to be left as nearly as possible, in certain localities, as it is. Now, take the locality of Tower-hill: lately 2,500 Catholics, not to speak of other religions, have been removed; their occupations principally were those of dock labourers, sack-makers, boot-makers, and ordinary tailors, and it was quite essential that they should be in the neighbourhood

Chairman—continued.

hood of their work. Take the dock labourers for instance. Some dock labourers are only casually employed; if a man is not in the neighbourhood and on the spot when the ganger wants him, he loses his job. Take the tailors; there are certain regulations with certain tailors' shops, that they will not employ, or they object to employ, men who live more than a mile from the work; and for obvious reasons. A gentleman or a person wishes a coat tried on, he desires a coat altered, or wants something to be done; and if the tailor is too far off, the employer finds it a difficulty and an injury to his trade, and so he gets a man who lives near; therefore it is necessary that they should be quite close to their work. Now another class of people in Tower-hill and Rosemary-lane, were what we call sackmakers, a large class of people, and they have been largely displaced. The sack-making is not always brisk; but at times those emplyed are at work day and night. Now, if these people were displaced and sent to a distance of a mile or a mile-and-a-half those poor women and poor girls would have to carry heavy loads on their heads, these great distances, with terrible inconvenience to themselves, and great fatigue; and, therefore, I say, for these and other reasons, that certainly in that neighbourhood, for nearly as many as are displaced, accommodation ought to be provided; and so in other localities of London.

1184. I suppose, therefore, it may vary according to the locality?—It might vary according to the locality.

1185. In some localities it would be necessary to have nearly as many; and in others you might do away with a good deal?—I think so.

1186. Did you hear the evidence of the last witness?—I heard a good deal of it.

1187. He said that two-fifths would be all that would be wanted?—I could not agree with a large proportion of his evidence according to my experience. His evidence about the workmen living in the country is opposed to my experience.

1188. Will you give the Committee your experience upon that point?—If people are to continue their work it is impossible for certain people to live in the suburbs, and the class of people who cannot live in the suburbs are dressmakers, waistcoat-makers, boot-makers, tailors, and partly for the reasons I have given, dock labourers and others; they must be near their work. Then as to cheapness, we must admit that, as a rule, the rooms are cheaper than in London, now, at the present prices, but it is a very serious and grave question, whether, taking all the circumstances together, workmen can live more cheaply in the country, and for these reasons. I have got the experience of people who have tried it, and their evidence is this. Let me take the class of men who take their breakfast at a coffee-house, who take their dinner at an eating-house, which is a great expense, but if they were living near their families, an economical wife could provide a dinner for the children, herself, and husband, for nearly the same price as if the husband were not away and had to pay for himself; and so that the extra price paid is so much in addition to the cheapness of rent.

Chairman—continued.

Again, it was also remarked by the last witness, that there are sales of cheap fish on Saturday nights; but more than that, in London you have sales every day; you can go to the fishmarket; you can go to the costermongers, and buy cheap fish and cheap vegetables, and you can go to the market, and buy cheap meat any day in the week. Again, if you go to Billingsgate late in the morning, you can get cheap fish; and these advantages you cannot get in the country,; and if you take all I have said into consideration, and I have the evidence of many men who have tried it, it is certain many of these men find living in the country more expensive than in London. Then, if you come to the labouring class, the hardships upon them are very great. I took the evidence of a number of labourers who live at Stratford. These labourers we will say, for argument's sake, have to go to Paddington to work, and if they live at a considerable distance from the station, they have to rise at four or half-past four o'clock in the morning, to catch the five o'clock train; they have then to come up by the Great Eastern Railway, and as there is no Metropolitan train to take them to Paddington earlier than a quarter-past six, and so those men lose a quarter of an hour out of their pay. But that is not my point. My point is the hardship of these hardworking men having to get up at four o'clock or half-past four o'clock in the morning, to come to work, and the same additional labour in the evening; and if they loose a train, they have either to pay for another train or walk a great distance. But the social result of it is very bad. The labouring men of this description scarcely ever see their families; their social intercourse is broken off from one end of the week to the other; as they go out too early and come home too late to be seen by their children except on Sundays. That is very pressing and very hard upon the labouring man, and I have heard it from a large number.

1189. Then you do not think that it would be sufficient to give these people, when they are turned out, sums varying from 1 *l.* to 5 *l.* or 10 *l.*, according to the length of residence, and let them find accommodation where they could?—It positively means ruin to many of them, and if you could only hear the complaints that we priests do, because we are in the midst of them, and hear their grumbling and try to help them, you would be astonished; and I believe, if you will let me say so, with all respect, that the way in which the poor are treated, and the want of consideration shown them, is tending to drive the poor of London to democracy and republicanism. They think that they are not cared for, and that they are trodden down by commercial interests, and I think that it would be a great thing if we priests could answer their murmurs and show them that they are not disregarded. It may be said in reply that model lodging-houses and Peabody Buildings are erected; granted they are, but they are let at a price that few of the class of people that I speak of could afford to pay; they are beyond their price and requirements. But the poor people want their lodgings in the neighbourhood, somewhat near the original prices that they have been paying; and further, the result of these Peabody Build-

Chairman—continued.

ings and model lodging-houses in the neighbourhood of the poor people is this: that the rents have gone up, and where there were cheap rents before in the neighbourhood, in others the prices of them have increased, and so the difficulty presses all round upon the poor people.

1190. You think that the rents of lodgings round these places rise in proportion?—Yes, I know it as a fact; what the poor people want are cheaper lodgings, and it seems to me, if I may say so, with respect, that those who destroy the houses of the poor in any neighbourhood (and I do not suppose they lose by it, but gain a great deal) ought to be compelled to give tenements in the same neighbourhood at a rate to suit the people who are displaced, and to meet their requirements.

1191. What sort of rent do these people pay generally?—They used to pay sometimes 1*s.* 6*d.* and 2*s.* for a room, and sometimes 3*s.* 6*d.* for two rooms; but the poor people are so placed, and they find it so hard to live, that they let out a part of a room, and get money by it; therefore, if you not only take away the chance of their letting, which, socially, is an improvement, but put on high rents, you see how hard it is upon them.

1192. But you would be of opinion that it is wise, if it could be done prudently, to clear away all these slums, if you can?—It would be an immense improvement, socially and morally; but, at the same time, I think, if I may be allowed to suggest, that it would be better, instead of sweeping the whole neighbourhood away at once, that when a neighbourhood is scheduled, only a portion ought to be pulled down at first, and then a corresponding proportion of tenements should be erected for poor people in the neighbourhood. Secondly, due notice ought to be given, that at a certain period, tenements would be built, or accommodation given, so that the people may hover around in the neighbourhood and tide their difficulties, till they come back again. Thirdly, I would suggest that when these poor people are turned out, when little shopkeepers who have made a good living, are turned out with but a few pounds, it is no compensation at all; that, where these new tenements are built, there ought to be little shops also built of various kinds, according to the wants of the locality. Fourthly, I would suggest that when the people are turned out, their names should be taken, and that the first preference to the new buildings should be given to the people turned out, and not to strangers. Take Tower-hill; the Peabody Buildings have accommodation, I believe, for 1,200 families. There are only 10 families of the original inhabitants in the Peabody Buildings. Finally, that tenements suitable to the requirements of the poor who are displaced should be erected in the same neighbourhood; for the Peabody Buildings are not suitable to many, as sack makers, costermongers, flower girls, and machinists, &c., are not admitted therein.

1193. What has become of all the other people at Tower-hill?—The dock labourers are hovering about Commercial-road; some of the neighbours have taken others to lodge with them, and some have found rooms in various places.

1194. Is there much overcrowding in con

Chairman—continued.

sequence of the pulling down, and people being obliged to stay and look for work there?—I believe that it is so.

1195. You think that there ought to be barracks or lodgings of a much cheaper character than the Peabody Buildings?—Much cheaper than the Peabody Buildings and the model lodging-houses, which do not meet the wants of the poor people at all.

1196. Have you gone into the question as to whether those places could be made to pay, supposing cheaper lodgings were built?—I respectfully suggest this: that as the Metropolitan Board of Works destroy houses of the poor, that they ought to be compelled to erect tenements by Government, and not take more interest than four per cent., and better still, if they did it for the same rate as they get the money lent to themselves, it would be a real boon, and would meet, to some extent, the wants of the poor.

1197. And then I understand you to say that, in your opinion, if care is not taken, the result upon the poor people would be felt socially and politically?—Yes.

1198. I do not mean between party and party, but as regards all parties?—I belong to no party at all; I have worked among the poor for 25 years. I founded a night refuge, where I take 200 people in every night; I know the complaints of the people, and I know what they want; and I am speaking merely in the interests of the poor.

1199. You mentioned a night refuge; will you tell us some particulars of the night refuge, which you built or provided?—Yes; I have a night refuge for men and women, besides a home for servants; and in the men's and women's department I can take in, with children, about 200 a night; any *bonâ fide* applicant is at once admitted, but tramp or imposter is received; but we always warn them if they make a false statement, that if, on inquiry, it is proved false, we will do no more for them, but if they tell us the truth, whatever their antecedents may have been, that is, if they brought about their poverty by drink or anything else, we will try to start them again in life. Their statements are taken down, and if their references are anywhere in London, there is a person who calls the next day to see if they are true; and it is upon the answers to these inquiries that we deal with the people; if the references are from the country, we have printed forms, and we send to the country for references, and according to the answers we deal with them.

1200. Do these people pay anything?—No; and there is no distinction of religion; we have more people belonging to other denominations than to our own.

1201. Besides housing them, do you feed them at all?—We give them bread and gruel night and morning, and in bad cases we give them three-pence a day for dinner, when they are looking for work. On Sunday, after they have been to their own service, they come back and we give them dinner, which consists of meat soup. Then take the case of a man who wants to get back to his family, say at Liverpool, we pay his way back; and if the man's tools are in pawn, and it is a genuine case, we take them out and start him again; and so we do in various cases.

1202. If

Chairman—continued.

1202. If that is done to the poor out of charity, do you think an institution of some kind can be carried on where some small payment might be required?—It might; but we take no payment. I should like like to add one thing more as to the refuge. We have there persons of every class at times, ladies who have been independent, and gentlemen who have kept their carriages; we have had the sons of judges, doctors, and people of every condition, and we have tried to start them on again, so that it is not merely for the lowest class.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1203. Have you inquired particularly into the amount charged in the Peabody and other buildings, for rooms?—I have asked particularly from different priests in the neighbourhood of the Peabody Buildings on several occasions, and I have their answers.

1204. You told the Committee that the poor in the district you alluded to pay from 2 *s.* to 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per week for one room?—Did pay 2 *s.*

1205. And it is now 2 *s.* 6 *d.*?—I said did pay 2 *s.* for one room, and 3 *s.* 6 *d.* for two rooms, and further, that the result had been that they very often took in a lodger.

1206. As to the Peabody Trustees, may I ask whether you are not aware that the Peabody Trustees charge about 1 *s.* 11 *d.* per room?—I am not aware of it at all.

1207. If I were to tell you that, you would modify your opinion about the Peabody Trustees being of no use?—If you will allow me, this is as far as I would go. I should have to reconsider my evidence, for I have had it from people who have been on the spot, and looked into it. I could not decide now.

1208. If you found they charged 1 *s.* 11 *d.*, you would modify your views as to the benefit the Peabody Trustees are to the poor?—If I found that on the average the Peabody Trustees were charging 1 *s.* 11 *d.* for a good room, I should modify that part of my answer; but still I should maintain that several classes of the poor were first allowed to live in the Peabody Buildings, and therefore that they were unsuited to such classes.

1209. Do you know anything as to Newport Market?—Yes.

1210. Do you know what the poor pay for rooms there?—I should think the rooms had gone up very much.

1211. Would you agree with me that they might vary from 3*s.* 6 *d.* to 4 *s.*?—Yes; it only confirms my remark, that rents have gone up on account of the Metropolitan Buildings and the Peabody Buildings; the rents were much lower before the Metropolitan and the Peabody Buildings came into existence.

1212. Having had a great deal of practical experience, do you approve of poor people living in one room?—I approve of a single woman or a single man living in one room, and I prefer that families, if they could afford it, should have two rooms. But let me take the case of people who cannot afford it; if they have very young children under three or four years, I do not see much objection to their living in one room, but once the children are beyond a certain age, it is imperative that something should be done, and that the family should not live in one room.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

1213. You said you did not agree with the last witness, who said that where a man and his wife and children were living in one room and had to leave, they should be compensated and be found a comfortable house in the suburbs, where they were offered two rooms for the same money, would they not be more comfortable in the suburbs with two rooms, and would not it make up for the disadvantages you spoke of, of dinners and other things?—No, certainly not.

1214. Do you think they would be better in one room?—No, not in one room.

1215. Take the case of a man who cannot afford more than one room; he must pay a certain sum, and for that sum he would get two rooms in the country, would not he be much more comfortable there than in a slum in the middle of London?—The majority of the working classes would prefer one room where there they could see their children evening after evening, and be with their wives, where their wives could bring them hot meals to their work, and a hot breakfast instead of being deprived of all these comforts.

1216. Socially, would you agree, as a clergyman, that it would be better for them to be out in the suburbs, having the benefit of the air, and two rooms and respectability, notwithstanding their being deprived of their hot dinners?—It is pulling the labouring people to pieces, sending them out in this way.

1217. Are you not aware that a vast number of the working classes join together and join societies, and are glad enough to pay so much a week and have these houses in the suburbs, where they are glad to go?—No, I am not aware of what you say, and did you notice the evidence of the last gentleman, who said that he took the census of the artizans and labourers, and that they all preferred being in London.

1218. I do not at all agree with what you say; I do not remember it, I will take your own opinion?—I have heard it said by a number of people. Let this be tried; build the places for them; try it in one neighbourhood, and if the people do not come back you have something to point at, but the people will, it is their inclination and wish to be back.

1219. You think they ought to be in one room, and that they would rather be in one room in a slum than in the country with two?—Is that a fair way of putting it?

1220. It is the practical way?—If you say, I want people, if it can be avoided, to live in the slums, I do not; but if those who are interested in the poor wish to raise the social condition of the poor, they should try and meet the feelings and wishes of the poor, who have feelings like ourselves, their wishes are to be with their families at home; and if you displace them with the idea of raising their social position, it is only right and equitable that you should provide cheap accommodation for them.

1221. Who is to pay for the cheap accommodation?—I suggest that if the Board of Works destroys their dwellings, and makes money thereby, they are bound to provide for the poor.

1222. As to the last observation of yours, do you allude to the Artizans' Acts of 1875 and 1879,

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

1879, or to the Street Improvement Acts?—I allude to the whole.

1223. Do you understand the difference between the Streets Improvement Acts of 1872 and 1877, and the Artizans Acts of 1875 and 1879?—Yes, I do.

1224. Are you not aware that, taking the Artizans' Acts first, the Metropolitan Board of Works, under the desire and order of the Legislature, were told to clear away certain districts at a very great cost; do you still adhere to your opinion that the Artizans' Act has brought no benefit, socially, to the poor; do you say that the Metropolitan Board of Works has made money by carrying out that Act?—I did not mean that; I say that the Board, whether it be in reference to the Artizans' Building, or the Improvements of the Streets, is supposed not to be a merely commercial body, but a body working for the interest of all classes, and I say the interest of the poorer classes ought to be considered, and attended to by them.

1225. You may take it that the Metropolitan Board loses, on behalf of the ratepayers, an enormous sum of money in carrying out the Artizans' Act?—I heard that they had lost something.

1226. As I am Chairman, you may take it from me, that we have lost enormous sums?—I wish they would lose something in getting cheaper lodgings for the poorer classes; it would be a great boon; but I have no personal interest in the matter.

1227. At the same time you have given very decided evidence, and it is for me to get your views out distinctly and clearly; you said you thought where improvements take place, if persons are displaced, their names ought to be given; are you aware that when the Whitechapel Improvement was carried out, one-half was done at a time, and when the buildings were up, the names of every one of the people about to be dispossessed in the other section were sent to the office of the Peabody Trustees; and are you aware that, out of that large number, only 11 availed themselves of the offer to go into the Peabody Trustees' Buildings, which were then close by?—Am I in order in asking a question. Is that always the case; is it always done?

1228. Are you aware that that was done?—I was speaking principally about Tower-hill when I made that remark, and I have been assured that it was not done there.

1229. You may take it that it was done in Whitechapel?—If it were done in every case it would be a great boon to the poor people, and take away one occasion of their complaints.

1230. How would it be a boon to the poor people if these poor people will not avail themselves of the advantages offered to them?—In some places I remarked that it was not so important to the poor people to avail themselves of it; in Goulston-street, and Castle-alley, Whitechapel, it would not be so important. In Castle-alley it would not be so important where several of the inhabitants were fruit sellers, because they can go a little further off, and it does not matter much to them.

1231. The costermonger can go; you do not think it is important for him to be near?—If he is near his market a quarter of a mile does not matter. Take Tower-hill and Rosemary-lane; take the sackmakers; there it is important they should have places near; each case must be judged upon its own merits, and the requirements of the locality.

1232. Then, what you wish to be done was done in Whitechapel, and you would be satisfied?—If it was done in every case I should be satisfied on that point.

1233. Then, down at Pye-street, there the Peabody Trustees had a vast number of names sent to them of people who are to be displaced at Newport Market; that would satisfy your requirements?—If what is suggested is done, and the people do not take advantage of it, I would not complain.

1234. You would not complain on their behalf?—Not if it is done in every case. I am only taking the sections of my proposition singly.

1235. It being the case that they do not take advantage of what is offered to them, we may assume they prefer finding their own lodgings either near or in the country, according to their own feelings?—I could not agree with that, for this reason, unless I knew at what price these new lodgings were offered, I could not give an opinion; the probability is that the price is too high, and in addition the restrictions in Peabody Buildings render them unsuitable to many of the poor.

1236. When I tell you that the Peabody rooms are 1*s.* 11*d.* and 2*s.*, why should not these people take them if they are so anxious for a better room?—That is quite opposed to my experience, and the experience of the clery who visit the Peabody Buildings; we know the people who live in them; we examine them, and it is against my opinion; I do not say it is not true, but it is against my experience; moreover, as I said previously, sackmakers, costermongers, and machinists are not admitted into the Peabody Buildings.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

1237. Have you had a great deal of experience amongst the poor of London in various localities, or in any particular locality?—I have had experience in the City and borders of the City. I have had before me official communication from the clergy, and their experience in having to deal with their poor, particularly in Tower-hill and Spitalfields.

1238. Have you visited them at their own homes sufficiently to know the sources of their income?—I have been at their homes when they have been out of work, when they have been in work, and at all times.

1239. Is it true as has been stated by some witnesses, that where the income is below 25*s.* a week, it has to be supplemented very much by the children and the wife?—It is so over and over again.

1240. Is it true, as has been stated, that the kind of occupation and work that the children and wives get is necessarily attached, and necessitates their living in the neighbourhood in which that work is derived?—Very often it is so; it is not always the case.

1241. Is that your experience of the majority of cases?—That is a large question to answer, with

yes

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

yes or no; certainly in a great number of instances it is so.

1242. Is not the work of the children and wife almost always derived from the residents or shopkeepers of the neighbourhood in which they reside?—In many instances that is so.

1243. Then would it not be practically impossible even if the man could live away from his work, that the children and wife could live away; would not they lose their work?—That refers only to a given number; taking the children up to seven and eight years, they cannot do any work; take the number of children up to 9 or 10, all they can do is, if the mother has any work, for one child to stay at home to mind the baby.

1244. When the children get over the School Board age, what then?—When a child is old enough to do any work, the poor people are too pleased to employ them, but you must know that the proportion is not so great when you come over the age of 12 or 14. I thought you were speaking first of parents.

1245. The question I put to you was this: where the income is below 25 *s.* a week, is not it, in the majority of cases, supplemented very much by the work of the wife and children?—Not in the majority of cases, but in many cases.

1246. From your experience of workpeople at present earning less than 25 *s.* a week, is it from the kind of work they could get and live four or five miles off?—I do not think it is in the majority of cases.

1247. Is that the reason why, in answer to a previous question, you said you do not think the mass of the working people, the lower range of them could live away from their work?—That is one reason.

1248. Is not it also another reason, that when they live in the suburbs, they are taken away from their friends, and from their amusements?—They are taken away from their friends, there is no question.

1249. Are they not taken away from the amusements they get in London, and which they cannot get in the suburbs?—I did not answer that question at first; the labouring classes of a certain kind get very little amusement; artizans do; but I am talking of people who get very little amusement; the society of their friends, which they are removed from.

1250. Taking it generally, do I gather that your opinion from your experience, is that in the case of the working classes, earning less than 25 *s.* a week, they cannot live away from their work?—The larger proportion cannot live away; I specified the class that cannot do so.

1251. The honourable Member for Truro told you that the names of the persons turned out have been given to the Peabody Trustees in two or three cases, if not in all; is there any difficulty on the part of the costermongers, and the lower class of working people, in conforming to the conditions imposed in the Peabody Buildings?—I believe so; take the sackmakers; I have been assured that they will not allow sackmakers to live in the Peabody Buildings.

1252. Will they allow any work to be done in the buildings at all?—They will not allow sewing machines, I am told.

1253. If that is so, in your opinion is that a

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

reason why the people that are turned out cannot occupy the new buildings?—It is part of the reason, but my main reason is what I have from the knowledge of those who have had great experience, namely, that the rents are too high for that class of people.

1254. Upon that point I thought the honourable Member who questioned you last, had satisfied you by pointing out that the average rent was 1 *s.* 11½ *d.* per room; do you think the average rent of other buildings, not belonging to institutions of that kind, is as low as that?—If that is the case, that is an answer.

1255. The Committee have it in a written document, delivered and printed in their report?—I believe some rooms in the Peabody Buildings, low down, which are not so desirable, are as cheap, but the better rooms are not let at that price, so I have been assured.

1256. Look at the schedule printed on page 291, and tell the Committee whether you are aware of the rent that is set out in that schedule?—How is this average struck.

1257. The table you are looking at gives you the absolute price, from which the average is struck; 1 *s.* 11½ *d.* per room. Now may I ask you looking at that table, do you not think that those rents are lower than the rents which the people must have paid for the rooms which they occupied before the Peabody Buildings were erected?—I do not think so, for another reason, that, as a rule, people used to sublet and thereby lower the rents.

1258. Do I understand you to say that previously a person would take three rooms and sublet one, and thereby reduce the average of the three?—I meant in a poor place, not in the Peabody Buildings. People who have one room would take in a lodger. I do not think it is a desirable thing, but so the rent was reduced. It is not the moral aspect of the case I am talking of.

1259. May I ask you whether you do not think it would be very unwise to allow subletting of any part of a single room?—I do think so if it could be avoided.

1260. With regard to the accommodation for single men and single women who could only afford one room, is it better that they should have one room as part of a family tenement, or that they should have a single room to themselves and be responsible entirely for its management?—You mean a single woman should have a single room and take another woman to live with her.

1261. Had she better have a single room to herself, or take one room, being part of a three room or four room tenement?—If it is possible and she could afford to pay for a single single room, she ought to take it, and whether it was part of a three or four room tenement, it depends upon the price, whether she could afford it, but in the majority of cases these women could not do it; morally, I think it is to be desired that they should not have companions living with them.

1262. Passing from that point, have you given your attention to any districts in which a large number of tenements have been cleared away and new buildings constructed?—Yes, Tower-hill, Rosemary-lane, and Spitalfields.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

1263. Do not you think that district has been benefited by the operation of clearing away the old habitations unfit for occupation and re-building them?—I think it has been an improvement in that sense, but it has been a great detriment to the people who are dislodged.

1264. What do you think could be done for the people who are dislodged, other than has been done?—I made my suggestions; what I thought was that cheaper buildings or tenements ought to be erected at cheaper prices for the people.

1265. You will admit that cheaper tenements involves an inferior tenement?—Yes.

1266. Do you think we should build down to poverty, rather than raise the poverty up?—If you do not increase the wages of the poor people, how are they to live?

1267. The table has shown that the rents are as low as they can be?—I do not want to press it any more, because it depends upon the way we look at it; if you look at it under the aspect that they are not allowed to sublet, that is one view of the matter.

1268. But you agree that they ought not to sublet, whether they are old tenements or new?—I agree morally; but what is a woman, who is half starving, to do? what is a man, who has but one meal a day, to do? I do not want it, but the poor people are bound to do things which they would not do of their own instinct, but poverty compels them.

1269. Ought the law to submit to an extent of overcrowding so as to cause disease?—Certainly not, to cause disease.

1270. Do you think that more than one family can occupy a room, and still fulfil sanitary conditions?—I think it is very doubtful; I think two single persons can live in a room, and two men can live in a room, and be healthy.

1271. Is there not plenty of accommodation for single men, where four or five live in one room, all over London, in lodging-houses?—The poor people have a great objection to common lodging-houses.

1272. Registered lodging-houses?—They think that they are sinks of iniquity; no decent man or woman would go near them.

1273. I understand you to say that you would not have lodging-houses registered?—I did not say that. I thought the point was this: You said that those men and women on whose behalf I was speaking, could go to these lodging-houses. I merely stated their objection to go because they consider them sinks of iniquity; and, moreover, if a reference comes from one of the lodging-houses in Spitalfields for my refuge, we do not take it; we know that they are bad places.

1274. You would not lead us to believe that lodging-houses, as a rule, are bad places?—I believe the majority of common lodging-houses are bad places.

1275. Do you think that single men and single women should be allowed to lodge in the same room without having such rooms registered?—I never said that.

1276. I understood you to say tha two men or two women might live in a room without its being a registered lodging house?—I say "might"; they might live without harm, but it is a dangerous experiment, and nothing in the view of a clergyman could justify it, but absolute want or starvation.

1277. Must we not come back to a policy which would prevent, if possible, more than one family living in one room?—If you can; if it be possible, without driving people to desperation, I agree with you. I feel very strongly for the poor, I know what they suffer, they feel that they are trampled down, and crushed down, and many people do not care for them. I know it from thousands, who are drifting year after year, down into democracy and republicanism; and instead of elevating them, these social improvements have only make the condition of the lower classes harder, and they are the ones who think they who later on will do harm to the country.

1278. May I ask you, whether you think the efforts on the part of the Peabody Trustees, to assist the poor by their buildings, has not been to some extent successful?—I say with all respect that my own experience, and the experience of a large number of clergymen is, that the Peabody Buildings do not touch that lower class of society at all. The people are continually complaining, and saying that the Peabody Trust have not carried out their duties; and that the Trust was intended to benefit the very poor.

1279. Do you think that they should be let at rents very much less than the cost of them would justify?—I think that some of the capital which they are putting by, ought to be spent in the reduction of the rent for the benefit of the poor.

1280. Do you think that the rents should be fixed with relation to the means of the poor, rather than in relation to the cost of the article?—Where there is a fund to supplement it, it ought to be fixed with relation to the means of the poor.

1281. You think the rent they now charge is not so low as it ought to be?—In the Peabody Buildings that is my decided opinion.

1282. And that it ought to be fixed at a sum which should be nearer the power of the poor to pay, than fixed with reference to the cost of it?—Yes, I think part of the capital ought to be spent in that way.

1283. You have had a good deal of practical experience of the poor; would it not be difficult to select the persons, if the article is to be sold so much less than its market value; it would become a sort of almshouses, would it not?—I would give the preference to people of good character, and who are trying to better themselves. People who were disorderly and given to drink, I would not allow to have the benefit of it; but the advantage should be given to the honest and hard-working people who want to support their families and children, and who cannot do it.

1284. Will you venture an opinion what the rent ought to be?—That, as a practical man, you must know requires a great deal of consideration. I did not know that I should be asked such a question; but, in a general way, my fellow clergymen and myself think that the rent ought to be considerably less, and meeting, as near as possible, what is paid by them now, considering the sub-letting and all; that would be a boon to the poor.

1285. Are

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

1285. Are you aware that the Peabody Trust is not a commercial undertaking?—Yes; but I am speaking generally of the Metropolitan Buildings and the Peabody Buildings.

1286. And, therefore, not being a commercial undertaking, the Peabody Trustees are capable of doing what they please?—Yes.

1287. In the interest of the poor?—Yes, I trust they will do something practical in the interest of the poor.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1288. Do you approve of the Metropolitan Board of Works supplying dwellings below cost price; I want to know what your view is of the functions of the Metropolitan Board of Works; I quite understand that you approve of a body like the Peabody Trustees supplying dwellings below cost price; but would you approve of the Metropolitan Board of Works doing the same?—I did not suggest that they should do it below cost price. I said that if they were to do it at a cost of 4 per cent. profit for building land, and repairs; or better, if they would do it for the same amount that they had the money lent to them it would be an immense boon to the poor people.

1289. Is it not the case that these improvements cost the Board of Works a very large amount of money; of course I mean the ratepayers?—Yes.

1290. And if you build up cheap houses upon expensive sites the burden on the ratepayers would be heavier?—Why should they become expensive sites? Simply because you turn the people out?

1291. I think not; they are expensive sites, because they are in situations where land is very valuable?—You have had to displace these people, and before they were displaced the land was not of the same value that it was after they were displaced.

1292. Not from the evidence that has been before us. The land, according to the statement of the arbitrators was of the value which the Board have given, quite independently of the displacement of the persons?—And not higher?

1293. And not higher?—Not higher. I thought I understood the other gentlemen who gave evidence, to say that if the Metropolitan Board of Works were to let their land for commercial purposes, instead of for these metropolitan buildings, they could get five and six, or much more per cent.

1294. Perhaps you have not seen another part of the evidence which came before us a day or two ago, to the effect that even if all the available land was used for commercial purposes, there would still be a loss to the ratepayers upon the improvement?—I think when the ratepayers are doing so much for the education of children in schools, it is the primary thing that they should raise their social position, and pay something for the poor people's lodgings.

1295. Would not the same thing apply to another necessary of life, namely, bread; would you have the Metropolitan Board of Works supply bread to the people below cost price?—If the Metropolitan Board of Works did something in the corn trade by which the interests of the

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

people were injured, and the price of bread thereby increased, I say they are bound in equity to do something to make up for it.

1296. It would not strike you as such a monstrous thing to the ratepayers to supply these necessaries of life below cost price?—I do not think that is the way to look at the question; I think that is a different question altogether; I do not think it is analogous or parallel to the case in point.

1297. Is not lodging one necessary of life; does it differ from other necessaries of life?—Yes, the lodging differs very much, especially when that lodging has been interfered with by a powerful body of men; if that powerful body come and interfere with the bread that the people eat, and make it dearer, in the interest of the starving poor they are bound to do something for those rendered starving thereby.

1298. If these lodgings are in such an insanitary state that they are dangerous to health, which is the basis upon which these Acts go, is it not an advantage that they should pay more for a better article?—Of course health is a very good thing to talk of, but the primary thing is, that the men and women should live. If a child has not sufficient clothing and food, that child will become diseased with all your better rooms. The primary thing is to give the poor sufficient food and sufficient clothes.

1299. Then you would have to prove to us that these people cannot live; could you do that?—I have nothing to prove; I have only to state my experience, that a large number of these people find it very hard to get sufficient food to eat, and clothing for the children, and in many instances their hardships are heightened by metropolitan improvements.

1300. You spoke of a certain number of the poor being swept away from the City, in Petticoat-lane, and other places: have any of those gone to the country, or to the suburbs of London?—We have tried to trace them; we have traced some of them, and found that they have gone to different parts, and in many instances they have lost their work and their business. In Petticoat-lane the people working there were principally translators of old shoes, and old boots, and translators of old hats; that is making old hats and old clothes, and old boots into new ones; and another class were those who sold old things in the lane; and many of them have lost their means of living.

1301. Have they not got another living?—Many have had to turn to something else, but look at the hardship of all this. I am only trying to put before the Committee what I know to be the hardships of the poor. I want you to feel as I feel; I want you to feel what I have felt with regard to these poor people and their sufferings, when they have been turned out by these improvements. I mean railway improvements; warehouse improvements, and improvements of every kind.

1302. We all know that there must be some hardship in a period of transition, but do you not know many cases of people that have got over that period of transition, and who are as well off or better off than they were before?—

Mr. *John Holland*—continued.

Some may; I know many cases where the better class of people have been driven to America.

1303. Is that in itself an evil?—It is an evil for any country when people are driven out by what the poor people think an act of injustice. It is an evil to any country, and it is only fostering and increasing that feeling which I say has a tendency to republicanism and democracy, and which I think every man ought to put his face against.

1304. You spoke of certain labourers living at Stratford and working at Paddington. Does it not strike you that that is rather a curious place to live at if a man is working at Paddington?—Not at all.

1305. Are there not many places in the suburbs much nearer Paddington than Stratford?—You would have these poor labouring men shift their abodes with every job they have?

1306. Then these labourers have not worked long at Paddington, and if they are working there now they may work somewhere else soon?—I mentioned Paddington because I have the facts.

1307. If people are working now at Paddington, may they not be working in the north or south of London at another job very shortly?—Yes.

1308. Therefore, unless they constantly shift their homes with every change of job they must be a long way from their work at one time or another?—I do not think so.

1309. How else could you arrange it?—If they were living in the east or west end of London, or in the centre of London, where they used to live, the distance to their work would be lessened by several miles.

1310. Supposing they are living in the east of London, they would still have a long way to go to Paddington?—But nothing like the distance from Stratford.

1311. It is simply a question of train communication?—It is more than that; it is a question of how early a man is to get up in the morning.

1312. Is it not a question of trains?—I put it upon the hardship of a man getting up earlier and going to bed later than in London.

1313. If his work is liable to take him to all parts of London, surely that kind of hardship is inseparable from his lot?—There must be a certain amount of hardship, but the hardship has been increased by driving the men out into the suburbs.

1314. I do not think you make out that point, unless you can show that it is always possible for the working classes to live near their work; but if their work is constantly shifting, they cannot live near their work?—Do you not think that the best way is to analyse the word "near." Supposing the work to be in London; surely, as a rule, a man would be nearer to his work in London than living in the suburbs. A man must at times live a distance from his work, but that distance ought not to be increased unduly by his being driven out into the suburbs; it has been increased unduly.

1315. I quite agree that a great deal has to do with the meaning of the word "near," but I think the facilities of communication should be included in the word "near"; as you may have

Mr. *John Holland*—continued.

a man on a direct line of railway, and he may have workmen's trains that may bring him much nearer his work than he would be if he lived in point of distance nearer. This man living at Stratford, had to wait for a train; it was not for the want of proper facilities for train communication?—I say it with all respect, the thing is to know what the men feel. I know what they feel. I am merely telling you the feelings of many workmen; you may propound theories, but theories do not always harmonise with facts. I have it from the men that they consider it a great hardship, and if they had not to live so far off, it would be a great boon to them. I am here to tell you what the opinion of the people is on this subject. I know what the people feel, and I know where the difficulty presses; and I wish respectfully to put this before you.

1316. You alluded to bootmakers, who must live near their work?—Tailors and bootmakers.

1317. Have you seen the paper, handed in by Mr. Gatliffe, in which he says that two bootmakers live, one four miles, and one seven miles, from their work?—I knew a tailor who lived out at Stratford, and he found it so difficult that he took a little room in London, and did his work there; but he found he could not get on with his work, and he had to bring his family to London, and take up poor lodgings. I hope that the Members of this Committee will not misunderstand me. All I have sought to do is to try and represent what I know to be the feelings of a large number of the poor people. I have had their confidences, and I have tried to help them, and soothe them in their trouble, and I am trying to give that experience to you, gentlemen, and nothing more.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1318. Do you think there are many idle people in the metropolis at the present time?—I believe in certain parts, at certain times of the year, there are a great many idle people.

1319. Are they idle from not being able to find work, or not taking work when they can get it?—I know numbers of people who are idle, and I allow them 2 *s.* 6 *d.* and sometimes 5 *s.* a week myself from funds that I have, to support them when they cannot get work, and families often have to come to my refuge for the same reason.

1320. Then is it your opinion that the metropolis is over populated with labourers?—If you like to put it in that way; I would rather not go further than what I say, that at certain times of the year there is not work for the people.

1321. Then if those people could be transported to where there was plenty of work it would be an advantage to them?—It would and it would not; it is all very well to say it is an advantage for a man to go and get work under trying circumstances, but these poor people have intense feelings; their affections are very strong; they do not like to be wrenched away from their associations and friends, and it is a great hardship upon them to be driven away. You speak of emigration, but many feel this like exile or transportation. There are a certain number of enterprising people, who go willingly; those that wish to go, let them go, and God speed them, but

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

but those who have a strong objection to going ought not by undue pressure to be sent away.

1322. You speak of some being obliged to emigrate; I presume the very poor; how do they find the money to do it?—I did not say that; there were some persons in Spitalfields who kept coal-sheds and other shops, who lived and saved money; but when they were displaced by the metropolitan improvements, seeing that it was hopeless as they thought, and that they could not start again, they said, "We have energy and strength, and we will go to America, and take our chance there."

1323. That is not the usual class, is it, that are displaced from the slums with which the Metropolitan Board of Works have to deal?—No, the little shops would be in a minority, but I remark that people of that condition have gone away out of Spitalfields.

1324. That would be the exception, not the rule?—The shopkeepers would be the exception.

1325. Can you tell me the average wages of the class that are displaced from the slums?—Take a dock labourer; it depends whether you take what he earns by the week, or all the year round.

1326. The average all the year round?—Some get constant work, but a number are only taken on at times. I do not suppose many of them earn 12 *s.* a week all the year round.

1327. Did I understand you rightly to say that you thought five miles from their work was not much too far for a labourer to walk?—I never said that, and I think it is too far, if it could be helped.

1328. Have you had any great amount of intercourse with persons who have gone out into the country and settled, and who have got on in the country. You have given instances of persons who have come back, but amongst those who have gone out into the country, and who have remained there, have you traced their doings?—I have traced them, and I know that a large number of them would come back to-morrow, with joy, if they could have suitable accommodation or lodgings; and even the Metropolitan Buildings are not sufficient; at their price, you want many more of them; but if there were lodgings suitable, I believe a large number would come back at once.

1329. Do you think that there are still a large number of persons to be dispossessed under these Acts of Parliament, if they are carried out?—That I am not able to speak to; I do not know how far the schedule goes, but I know they are dispossessing a great number.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1330. I presume you are aware that there are two Acts of Parliament, speaking shortly, one which was passed in 1868, and amended in 1875, and another, that which bears the name of the Right honourable Chairman, which was originally passed in 1875?—Yes, I have seen them.

1331. Are you aware that in the one case the duty is laid upon the Board of Works, acting for the whole town, and out of the means of the whole town, to sweep away large blocks, including very bad dwellings, and some which are not very bad, but which in the general improvement will get removed?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

1332. While the Act of 1868 only contemplated gradual emendation of the district from time to time and place to place, as it might be required, it gave authority and imposed a duty upon the local authority, upon the vestries?—Yes.

1333. Do I understand that in your view it would help materially to meet the necessities, which, I apprehend, as you state are very diverse and discrepant in many parts of the town, if means were found by which the district authority, whether it be the vestry, or if it should become the corporation of a portion of a town or any authority of that kind as distinguished from the Board of Works, should have the duty imposed upon it of removal and repair?—I have not thought of the question as to who should do it. I was only talking of the general removal and what would be beneficial to lessen the evils which the poor people suffered under; and it would be immaterial to me who did it.

1334. The difference is that Parliament has imposed upon the more localised action the duty of replacing what it removes, whereas in the other case the Board of Works is not expected to replace what it removes, the consequence is that the Board of Works naturally looks very anxiously to the great loss incurred of pulling down without the power to replace?—I say it with great respect, but I should like the Board of Works to be compelled to put up a certain number of houses in some way or other, for the needs of the district, wherever the homes of the poor are destroyed.

1335. Contradistinguished from the local authority?—I do not say anything about the local authority; I would put the Board of Works in the same position, and make them do the same.

1336. In addition to the persons who live by local labour, may I ask you to say whether there is not a very important and pitiful dependant class, namely, widows with children whose support depends upon themselves, if they do not look for alms?—Yes.

1337. Is it possible, in your view of decent living or Christian life, that those women should be driven with their children into the country, even if they got a cottage for nothing, or at a very low price, when they must come for their work into the town early, and return late?—Certainly not; I ought to have put them into my category.

1338. I want you to append that to your other classes?—I intended to put that class of women into my category, and I had a note about them.

1339. There is another very large class, I apprehend, within your daily cognisance, the single women who live by very hard industry, and get very miserable wages, who are very badly clothed, and generally very badly fed, is it possible, with any consistency or common sense, to ask those women to live at a distance from their work?—I would say it is not only great unkindness, but injustice to them.

1340. With all the strong feeling which possessed you of what it is your duty to tell the people, is it possible to hope that if you tell women exposed in that way to seven months of winter's weather, coming to their work from a distance

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

distance of two or three miles, to keep sober, there is any hope of your being obeyed?—I am sure they would not remain sober.

1341. I think the district which you overlook includes a part of Bethnal Green?—Yes.

1342. Your duty leads you to serve the whole of the north-east of London, as Vicar General?—Yes, and the whole of London.

1343. Will you tell the Committee shortly what sort of town you have to look over. Is it a four storeyed town, a three storeyed town, or a two storeyed town?—A large quantity has been pulled down.

1344. Taking that which remains—the whole district east of the city; is it a four storyed town?—No.

1345. Or a three storeyed one?—I think in some places there are three storeys.

1346. But generally speaking, if the local authority possessed the power of replacing from time to time, and from place to place, as the over crowding of the population requires, could they not, even if they had no new sites at all, add immensely to the house accommodation?—Decidedly so. They have only to take some of these miserable places, buy them up, and put up proper buildings at a very cheap rate.

1347. Putting four storeys where there are only three?—Yes.

1348. Without going into matters of the building trade, we know that that is practically impossible to be done by the poor people themselves?—Yes.

1349. And unless there is some authority or some power above them, to replace their miserable tumble-down cottages with decent four-storeyed houses, it will not be done?—Certainly not.

1350. I understand you to tell the Committee that in your opinion and experience of common lodging-houses, and the Peabody Buildings, and all the other aggregate forms of rebuilding, you would rather see the town gradually rebuilt in its normal condition, in houses, and streets, and courts, with proper ventilation, than have the people compelled to go into these great places?—Decidedly, that is my opinion.

1351. You think it more conducive to their health and morality?—I speak about the registered lodging-houses very strongly—I do not speak so strongly about the others, but I believe that a large number, and especially the Irish, do object to that indiscriminate mixture of people on the staircase; and of children at play. I have been told that there is great danger to morality in the Peabody Buildings, and that the Irish people particularly object on that ground, and some facts have been mentioned to me, but I have not been able to verify them.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

1352. I think I understood you to say that from your great experience of the poor, you would say they would prefer to live in the slums, in which they at present live, than have new buildings erected for them under the terms of the Act of 1875, Sir Richard Cross's Act?—Under the terms that we have already specified.

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

1353. Yes, all things considered?—I say the poor would rather remain as they are.

1354. Notwithstanding the fact that from the evidence we have had before us, we find that the death-rate of the old dwellings was in many cases as high as 31 per 1,000, whereas in the new model dwellings, it comes down to 18 per 1,000?—You ask me what the poor people wish; the poor people do not trouble much about death; the increase in the death-rate would not affect them very much; they think nothing of attending friends in contagious diseases; they have little or no fear on the subject. I only talk of what their feelings would be. I think the poor would desire to have better accommodation, if they could afford it; but they cannot afford it.

1355. Of course with regard to the question of price, your opinion would be modified, if it could be proved that you could get a room in the Peabody Buildings at 1 *s.* 11 *d.* a week?—It was shown that the Peabody Buildings would come, striking an annual average, to over 3 *s.*

1356. If it was proved that you could get a good room in the Peabody Buildings at 1 *s.* 11 *d.* a week, I said?—But even then there would be a great difficulty, for the poor people are in the habit of subletting their rooms, and the Peabody Buildings do not allow subletting.

1357. You say that they would rather remain where they are than remove into the suburbs?—Certainly; a large class would.

1358. And that they would prefer it for social reasons, and on the grounds of morality; those are the chief grounds upon which you base their objections; they prefer to remain where they are, so that their families should not be broken up, and so that they should not have to get up so early in the morning?—Yes.

1359. Do you put their objections at all upon the ground of not having sufficient train accommodation?—No; I put it upon the ground of their being so far away, practically all the week having no social or any other kind of intercourse with their family, going out so early in the morning and coming home so late at night; so that it is only on Sunday that they have any intercourse with their wives and children.

1360. Have you any experience of the trains run by the Metropolitan Railway, whether they are run at early enough hours in the morning?—I have heard of one train by which the people come from Stratford, and if they have to go westward, to Paddington say, there is no train on the Metropolitan line, getting on to Paddington earlier than quarter past six, so that men are mulct that much for being late.

1361. Do you know anything about the fares charged on that line?—Yes, the fares are as moderate as possible.

Mr. *Bryce.*

1362. I understand you to attribute the unwillingness of the poor to go out, to three causes. The first is their habits of association with places where they now live; the second, the fact that they cannot well live more than a certain distance from their work; and the third is that the wives and children of the workmen also in many cases do

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

do work, and they cannot be taken far off?—Yes.

1363. Those are the three chief causes?—Yes; and many maintain that it is cheaper to live in London than out of London.

1364. For the necessaries of life?—Taking the expense of lodgings and the necessaries of life; they strike a balance, and find it cheaper to live in London.

1365. You spoke of the hardships to which the people were exposed by being turned out when their houses were taken for improvements; would it meet your views if the erection of new dwellings were done on so large a scale, and with such foresight, as that wherever there was an improvement which turned out a number of people, there was given a new set of dwellings ready to be occupied, so that the first choice should be offered to those turned out?—That is what I should suggest, and I should like the offer to be given first to those who have been turned out.

1366. I understand you think that both the Peabody Buildings and the other workmen's dwellings, erected by private companies, have not, speaking generally, touched and relieved what we call the lowest class?—They do not touch them; they are above them, like big balloons over their heads.

1367. How would you propose to touch that lowest class?—The only way to touch it is by doing what I suggested, and giving the people not such good accommodation, but giving them wholesome accommodation, air, light, and water, and providing them cheaper tenements.

1368. Would you propose that people should live in any smaller dwellings than what they live in now in the improved dwellings of some of these other companies; you would not propose them to live in smaller rooms?—Not if it can be avoided; but you must first let the poor live and have sufficient food and clothing, that is the first thing, and the first consideration.

1369. Is it not the only difference now, that in point of fact, in the private lodgings where they live, they are allowed to crowd a greater number of persons into one room, than they are allowed to do by the Peabody Trustees?—Yes, that is the difference.

1370. Is it not simply that they pay as much now, in these poorer dwellings, as they pay in the Peabody Buildings, only they cannot put so many people in?—They may pay now as much, but they used not to do before the improvements took place, and similar buildings were put up; that raised their rents, and pressed hard upon the poor; the rents before these metropolitan buildings were erected and the rents now are very different.

1371. Do you mean that there has been a sensible rise of rent of late years, owing to this pressure?—Yes; if you put up a metropolitan building in the neighbourhood of little tenements, the rents go up at once; they ask 1 *s.* more for a room.

1372. How do you account for it, that private owners have not raised the dwellings an additional storey, and that the new houses are not put up four or five storeys; remembering the answer that you gave to the honourable Member for Finsbury, you said that in this part of London the houses are mostly two and three-storied houses?—I cannot answer that question: I suppose it is that they have not the energy, or a speculative turn of mind, and they very often have not the capital.

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

1373. I was struck by a suggestion which you made, to the effect that the Peabody Trustees should spend their surplus in reducing the rents; but would not the result be that you would still get the better members of the working class, and that the poorer ones would be left out?—It may be so; I think that the poorer class have an objection to live under rule, and be subject to restrictions; in the Peabody Buildings you have to do the washing of clothes on a certain day, and there are several other restrictions, and many of these people do not like to be tied up in that way; they want liberty.

1374. May I take it that one reason why neither the Peabody Trustees nor the other companies have quite reached the poorest class is, because they have built houses that are, on the whole, too good?—Yes.

1375. And it would have been better if they had contented themselves with building a rougher and simpler kind of thing?—Far better.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

1376. What rent do you think that these people of whom you have spoken can afford to pay; you say that the existing rent of 1 *s.* 11½ *d.* or 2 *s.* for a room is too much?—Rents vary in different localities and in different neighbourhoods, therefore some people shift from one place to another, to get cheaper rents. If you were to take what was the case in Tower-hill, before the improvements you might get a room there for 1 *s.* 6 *d.*; you might get a back room at the top of a house a little cheaper, for 1 *s.* 3 *d.* per week, and you might get two rooms for half-a-crown a week.

1377. And you would like to see buildings erected which would enable the poorer classes to get a room on those terms?—On terms that the poor people can afford.

Mr. *Cropper.*

1378. Do you not think that these trades accumulated themselves in a district just because the rents were low; there is no particular reason why tailors, and sackmakers, and bootmakers should be in that district?—Certainly; take Tower-hill, the docks are close by.

1379. Why should bootmakers be there?—I put bootmakers as a class. I said the majority were sackmakers. The sack-making is largely used for the ships, and the sackmakers must be in the neighbourhood of the docks.

1380. My experience has been that those kinds of manufactures go into places where they find wages are low, and the wages are able to be low when the rents are low; the whole thing works together?—Very likely.

1381. Therefore, eventually, those sort of trades will go from one place to another, and there will always be a sort of misery when they have to change?—I think the sackmakers must remain where the shipping is. At Spitalfields Market

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

Market there are sackmakers who have to work there.

1382. Do you not think that if the people had houses given to them for nothing almost, it would simply make their employers give them less wages for their work?—I am afraid there are some masters who might take that sordid view of the case, but many would not.

1383. Therefore, if we found houses for nothing for these people, it would be putting so much lower wages into these people's hands?—I think there are many noble exceptions, who would not act in that way.

1384. I am afraid that would be the effect of it?—Certainly not, in the majority of cases.

Chairman.

1385. I understand that what you mean is this, that the Peabody Buildings, and the buildings of all these commercial companies, though they are very good in their way, are found to be expensive for the poor?—Yes.

1386. And you think that a cheaper class of accommodation might be built; I do not mean as a charity, but that less money might be spent upon the building, and that the accommodation wanted might be of an inferior character?—That is my view, including the other suggestions I have made.

1387. And in that way a great many of these people might be housed?—Yes, and thereby saved from much misery and hardship.

Monday, 20th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.
Mr. Torrens.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. WILLIAM BIRT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1388. WHAT office do you hold in the Great Eastern Company?—That of General Manager.

1389. The Committee understand that the Great Eastern Company have established a system of workmen's trains?—That is so.

1390. When did they do that?— Certainly more than seven years ago.

1391. Then you have had considerable experience as to its working?—We have.

1392. Will you tell the Committee generally, first, what time the trains start in the morning, and the last in the evening; where they start from, and where they go to?—I will read a short memorandum which I have prepared, that will meet the case. "The Parliamentary obligation on the Great Eastern Railway in connection with the running of workmen's trains is to be found in the Great Eastern Railway Metropolitan Station and Railways Act, 1864. The section that deals especially with it is No. 80; there are several other sections, but I need not trouble you with them, because that is the material one. It requires that we should run a workmen's train from Edmonton to Liverpool-street every week-day, and from Walthamstow to London, not later than 7 o'clock in the morning, and one back at night to both those places after 6. As a matter of fact we run four workmen's trains daily from Edmonton to London. Each train does not stop at each station; the stoppages are arranged to meet the requirements of the traffic."

1393. How far is it from Edmonton to Liverpool-street?—Nine miles. Every station included in the Parliamentary obligation is accommodated by one or more of the workmen's trains. Although the obligation is to start the trains from Edmonton only, we start them from Enfield, which is the next station but one below Edmonton, because it is the terminus of the line, and we apply the workmen's fares at Enfield the same as at Edmonton. The fare charged is 2 *d.* for a return ticket, which is available on the day of issue only, and the arrangement regarding the return of the workman is that they are at liberty to return by any train after 4 o'clock, and on Saturday by any train after 12 o'clock.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1394. Is it 2 *d.* for the whole distance there and back?—The whole distance there and back. Then we run three trains from Walthamstow to Liverpool-street, the fares and conditions being the same as in the case of the Edmonton fares. In addition to those trains from Edmonton and Walthamstow, which we run in compliance with the Parliamentary obligation, we run two trains for workmen from Stratford to Liverpool-street. Stratford is on our main line, and we run two trains from Stratford Market to Liverpool-street. These trains call at Coborn-road, and the fare charged by them is 2 *d.* for the return journey.

Chairman.

1395. Just the same as it is to Enfield?—Yes; and there again we allow the workman to return by any train after 4 o'clock upon any weekday, and after 12 o'clock on Saturdays. Those tickets, like those which we issue from Edmonton and Walthamstow, are available not only to Liverpool-street, which is the Parliamentary obligation, but to Bishopsgate-street and Bethnal-green, at the option of the holder; they are the two next stations to Liverpool-street. Then we issue workmen's tickets from Stratford Market to Canning Town, Tidal Basin, Custom House, Silver Town and North Woolwich.

1396. All down by the river?—Yes, by two trains daily. We run them for the accommodation of labourers employed at the docks and at the manufactories on the Thames.

Mr. *William Holms.*

1397. At what hour do the two trains run?—I will give you it directly. The fares charged are from Stratford Market to Canning Town 2 *d.* for the return journey; from Stratford Market to the Tidal Basin, or the Custom House, 3 *d.*

Chairman.

1398. Why is that dearer?—It is a further distance.

1399. It is not as far as Enfield?—No. There is

Chairman—continued.

is a Parliamentary obligation in the case of Enfield, but not in the other; from Stratford Market to Silver Town, or North Woolwich direct the return fare is 4 *d.*

1400. That is not a Parliamentary obligation either?—No. These tickets are available by one train in the morning, and they are available for the return journey by any train after 4 o'clock, and on Saturdays after 12 o'clock; but we issue those tickets by an afternoon train as well, and they are available for return the next day by a train which starts from North Woolwich at 6.20 in the morning. The tickets are issued for the accommodation of what in the neighbourhood is called the night shift; that is the men working at night.

1401. Of course they are general tickets; anybody may take them?—Yes.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

1402. You have not given the time of the morning train?—5.17. Then we also issue workmen's tickets from Canning Town, and Tidal Basin, to North Woolwich, or to the intermediate stations, at 2 *d.* each.

Chairman.

1403. Is that a Parliamentary obligation?—No. These tickets are available by one train in the morning, and for the return journey after 4 o'clock, and after 12 o'clock on Saturday; they are also available by one train in the afternoon, for the accommodation of the men working at night. Then we also issue workmen's tickets from Stratford Market to Beckton. Beckton is where the Gas Light and Coke Company's works are opposite Woolwich Arsenal. We issue them by two trains daily, and the return fare is 4 *d.*

1404. That is not a Parliamentary obligation?—No. And from Canning Town, Tidal Basin, or Custom House, to Beckton, the return fare being 2 *d.* These are also available by one train in the morning, and return after 4 o'clock, as is usual, in the afternoon; but again here they are also available by one train in the afternoon and for the return journey in the morning, for the accommodation of the night shift. Those tickets to and from Beckton were arranged by agreement with the Gas Light and Coke Company, whose property the railway from the Custom House to Beckton is; and they were arranged to suit the accommodation of the men employed at the gas works. Then we have a service of steamers between North and South Woolwich, and we issue workmen's return tickets by those at 1½ *d.* each for the double journey.

1405. Where do they go from and to?—North Woolwich to South Woolwich.

1406. Just across?—Just across the river. There are six boats each way, each morning. The regulation is that the return tickets are available after 4 o'clock.

1407. Is that done by Parliamentary obligation?—No.

1408. What time do the boats begin to run?—At 10 minutes past 5 in the morning.

1409. Have you told us all the accommodation that you afford?—That is the whole accommodation that we afford.

Chairman—continued.

1410. Can you tell us the number of passengers, or the number of carriages that you have to employ, so as to give us an idea of the number of people who go?—I have not got the number of carriages, but the number of passengers during the course of a week, under these arrangements, is between 41,000 and 42,000.

1411. You have to divide that by six in order to get the daily amount?—Yes.

1412. Has it been pretty constant, or is it growing?—It is growing.

1413. Has it grown of late years, much more than during the earlier years?—Yes, very materially, and we have had to increase the number of trains for the accommodation of the traffic.

1414. Does that traffic pay?—It does not pay. On the other hand, I am quite sure that it has done the Great Eastern Company a large amount of harm.

1415. Before you go into the question of harm, how came it that the Parliamentary obligation was put upon you?—It arose out of an application which we made to Parliament for the construction of our Metropolitan line, and our having in the construction of that pulled down many houses which were occupied by the labouring classes.

1416. It was in consequence of the demolitions that you had to make that the Committee imposed this obligation upon you?—Yes.

1417. Did you fight the clause in Committee?—I think not.

1418. You had to accept it?—We accepted it.

1419. Now you are going to tell us why it has done you harm?—First of all we have to set aside special carriages for the accommodation of the workmen, which are not available to the ordinary requirements of the traffic of the day, or else we have to allow them the use of our ordinary carriages, which they injure a great deal.

1420. Are the carriages they go in the same as the ordinary third-class carriages?—We select our worst as far as we can.

1421. You do not make them on purpose?—No; but setting aside our old ones means that we must have additional new ones for the ordinary traffic. Another evil which we find is this, the workmen congregating on the platform at Liverpool-street, as they do on their return home, when the ordinary traffic of the day is going on, causes a very large amount of inconvenience to the ordinary passengers. At one time we observed our Parliamentary obligation, and did not allow the workmen to go back until after 6 o'clock in the evening, but we found that they came to the station when they had finished their work, and we were glad to get rid of them, and we said, You may go at any time, after 4.12 on Saturday, as we found that was the less evil. Then we find this that the ordinary class of passengers do not reside in the neighbourhood where the workmen reside in large numbers, and we believe, and rightly, I think, that there is a substantial loss arising to the company from that fact.

1422. You think that had it not been for the workmen going to these places, some buildings would have sprung up that would have brought you

Chairman—continued.

you better traffic?—Precisely. Our experience is this, that the ordinary third-class passengers, and ladies especially, do not like to travel with workmen who may be travelling in their working dress.

1423. They come back in their working dress?—Necessarily so.

1424. They come all muddied over from their work in their working dress?—Yes.

1425. Have you any trouble with them, as a matter of order?—No; I cannot say that we have. What is found to be a nuisance with these men is that they smoke a good deal, and in smoking they are apt to spit, and the platforms get in a very filthy state, in such a state, indeed, that ladies do not care to pass over them; and it was that which very materially induced us to say, "Well, you may go back any time you like after 4 o'clock."

1426. Do you find that the traffic where you charge 3 *d.* and 4 *d.*, not under the Parliamentary obligation, pays?—It does pay, no doubt, for this reason, it is not to London, it is between country stations; that is the Custom House. The Custom House is one of the main stations for the Victoria and Albert Docks, and where the 3 *d.* and 4 *d.* fares over the small distances apply, I may say they pay.

1427. What sort of people go by these trains. Dock labourers or other persons?—They are the labouring classes of all possible kinds. We find that many men in the City, who act as porters in warehouses, who are a class of people for whom the privilege was never intended, made considerable use of them.

1428. You think they are rather above the class for which the Act was intended?—Yes.

1429. What sort of wages do they get?—About 24 *s.* a week I should think.

1430. What sort of houses do these people live in when they get away?—They vary a good deal; they are generally houses that let for about 7 *s.* a week, each house accommodating two families.

1431. How many rooms do they get in that house?—A minimum of three each, with one or two rooms, a kitchen and so on, which are common to both families.

1432. Three rooms to each family?—Three rooms for each family.

1433. And a common room besides?—Yes. Other gentlemen may give you more accurate information than I do; but I am not far wrong in that.

1434. Who built those houses?—I think speculative builders more than any one else.

1435. Are the sanitary arrangements good?—I should be very sorry to answer for many of them.

1436. Are they within the area of the Metropolitan Building Acts?—No doubt they would come within it.

1437. Do those Acts extend as far as Enfield or Edmonton?—I am not certain of the extent to which they go; but they include Tottenham, and to Tottenham we carry a very large number of the working classes.

1438. Do the steamers pay you?—Taken as a whole, they do; but if we had to run them for the workmen's traffic they would not pay; they

Chairman—continued.

are running all day long for the ordinary traffic, in addition to the special trips.

1439. Do you know anything of the condition of the wives and children of the workmen in these outlying places?—I cannot tell you.

1440. Do you know if there is any employment for the wives or other members of the families in those outlying neighbourhoods?—I do not think there can be; they are suburban districts without any manufactures, therefore I cannot think that there can be any employment for the children; of course the children have the benefit of the purer air, and the very excellent school accommodation which is being provided in the whole of our district by means of the School Board.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1441. How long have these trains been run by your company?—At least seven years.

1442. Have you noticed that there has been a great increase in the workmen's houses during that period?—Yes, a great number.

1443. Are they growing rapidly?—Yes, many parts of our district are spoilt by them.

1444. What do you call being spoilt by them?—All the better class of people are being driven away from the neighbourhood. I lived for some years in what was a nice country lane called Hanger-lane, which connects Stamford Hill with the Green-lanes; I went there several years ago, but I have recently moved because of the class of houses which have just been put up by speculative builders, and by the large increase in the working class population.

1445. Is there any complaint of the manners and habits of the working class; do they misbehave themselves; do the police complain of them?—I have heard of such complaints, and for myself, I can say that I generally knew when 11 o'clock on Sunday night came, without the use of a watch or a clock.

1446. That would be very much the same elsewhere, would it not?—Probably it would.

1447. You said there was a minimum of three rooms in the cottages?—I should not like to say minimum; I said, I think that it was the general allowance; three rooms to each family with the use of the common room.

1448. Do you know anything about the price of rooms that these poor people would have to live in in the slums from which they have been removed?—No.

1449. What is the price of the three rooms?—I said I thought the rent of their houses was 7 *s.*, let to two families.

1450. Three shillings and sixpence, while they would only get one or two rooms for that price in the interior of London?—I have no information upon that; I have not had occasion to go into it.

Mr. *William Holms.*

1451. You told us that the amount of traffic per week is between 41,000 and 42,000; what was the traffic five years ago; have you any idea what the difference is now from what it was then?—I do not know, but it was very much less.

1452. It is steadily increasing?—Yes.

Mr. *William Holms*—continued.

1453. You stated that probably the rent is 7 *s.* per week; is that for a house of three rooms, or for a larger sized house?—The larger sized houses.

1454. That is a house with five rooms?—No, I should rather put it down at seven rooms; that is three rooms for each family, and one common room for the two families.

1455. Can you give us any idea of the proportion of traffic between the outlying stations and Liverpool-street; that is coming into the City, compared with the purely suburban traffic; that is from such places as Stratford to North Woolwich?—The traffic of the workmen's trains to Liverpool-street is very much larger indeed than the traffic of the workmen's trains between Stratford and the Custom House, or other outlying places.

1456. It is entirely between the outlying places and Liverpool-street?—The Liverpool-street traffic is about three-fourths of the whole.

1457. Can you give the Committee any idea of the proportion of purely labouring men and middle class people, such as you refer to, who are in a better position than labourers?—I have no information upon that.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1458. You are in an exceptional position, I think, with regard to workmen's trains, among railway companies?—In this respect of having an obligation, whereas many other companies have not.

1459. Is not the disadvantage which you speak of due to that fact; suppose that all the railway companies equally had the same obligation that you have, to run workmen's trains, would not the proportion of the disadvantages that you would be under be very much decreased. I suppose that workmen congregate at these towns because they can get up to London and back for 2 *d.*?—Of course if the same obligation existed with other companies, it might have the effect of withdrawing some of the workmen from our district.

1460. Did the great population that you speak of at these places, like Stamford Hill and Tottenham, spring up after your line was made, and you began to run workmen's trains?—Certainly.

1461. It was, in fact, in consequence of that obligation that the large working class population sprung up?—I have no doubt of that.

1462. Supposing that the obligation had been equal all over London, the part which would have fallen to your lot would have been somewhat smaller?—No doubt.

Chairman.

1463. Still as you have the misfortune, if it be so, of having your London stations in the crowded parts of the East End, it would affect you more than the London and North Western, for instance?—I daresay it would, but I do not think quite to the extent that you imagine, because Liverpool-street is some distance away from most of the docks.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1464. Does not the London and North Western come into Broad-street?—It is the North London strictly speaking that runs in there.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

1465. Can you tell me where the great centre of the working class population is along your line; take from Edmonton or Enfield; there are a large number at Enfield?—I have got a return showing the number of workmen that we brought up to Liverpool-street last week from all stations between Enfield and London, and Walthamstow and London; and I find that the largest number from any one station came from Edmonton.

1466. How many did you have?—Three thousand and fifty-five; the next largest was from St. James's-street, that is a Walthamstow Station.

1467. How many came from there?—Two thousand six hundred and ninety-four; the next largest number was 2,333, which came from Hoe-street, that is the station below St. James's-street.

1468. Can you account for this large number coming from the more distant spots; it appears, for instance, that at Stamford Hill it would be much nearer, and that you would have a larger number the nearer the station was to London?—Yes.

1469. Can you account for it?—I do not know what actuated the working men in going so far as that.

1470. Take Edmonton, is that quite the common class of workmen who come from there?—I have no exact information upon that subject, but I should say that the class coming from Edmonton was about the same as the class coming from most of the other stations included in this list.

1471. It is not a superior class, you think?—No, I could not say that.

1472. Can you tell me where the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works ends?—I am sorry I cannot give it.

1473. Is Stamford Hill included?—It must be, but I would rather somebody else gave the information.

1474. At Edmonton are there any local bye-laws having reference to the building of houses?—I do not know, but I should imagine there were.

1475. I suppose there is a sanitary board at Edmonton?—I should think so; there must be one.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

1476. Can you tell us what the longest distance is from London to where you run trains at 2 *d.* the return ticket?—Ten and three-quarter miles.

1477. Where is that from?—Enfield to Liverpool-street.

1478. And back?—Yes.

1479. Do you find that the traffic of these working men's trains entail an extra staff on you?—Yes, because all these trains necessarily have to run earlier in the morning than the trains for the ordinary traffic of the day.

1480. That is one of the disadvantages of this accommodation which you speak of?—Yes; it is one of them, but by no means the greatest.

1481. I understand, from what you say, that the accommodation which you supply as to working men's trains is more than what you are compelled to supply under the obligations imposed upon you?—Very largely in excess. My directors felt that it was a very important question

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

tion that required solving in some way, and they determined to run more workmen's trains than by law they were required to do; but that decision was come to many years ago; if they could have foreseen the inconvenience of it, and the loss, I think that our course of action would have been different from what it was.

1482. Do you intend to continue this accommodation, although it does not pay the company?—Well, of course, having once begun to give this accommodation, it would be a very awkward thing indeed to attempt to withdraw it; and my belief is this, that the directors of the company will not withdraw it, but that they will not extend it.

1483. Have you any intention of raising the fares so as to make it pay?—No; I do not think we should do that; we are, of course, bound by Parliament as between Edmonton and London, and Walthamstow and London, therefore we could not lift the fares from those places.

1484. Do you say that this obligation has been imposed upon you by the Committee in consequence of your having had to pull down certain building accommodation in the East of London?—I believe that was so.

1485. Is there not an obligation laid upon you equally with all other railway companies, of running a certain number of working men's trains?—I am not aware of it.

1486. Do you not know the Act passed in 1844, which contained a clause imposing very distinct obligations upon certain railway companies or all the railway companies to run cheap artizans' trains?—That is the Parliamentary obligation train at 1 *d.* a mile; that was not a workman's train in the ordinary sense of the word, or in the sense in which "workmen's trains" is interpreted in the present day.

1487. Was not the obligation of that clause that you should run trains at not more than 1 *d.* a mile, and at early hours, to suit the working classes?—Not that I am aware of; at all events I do not think that that clause has any bearing upon the workmen's train question of the present day.

1488. I suppose that you hold the working men who use these workmen's tickets very particularly to the terms under which you issue the tickets?—No, just the reverse; we put a very large interpretation upon it, I may say that we could require the workman, if we chose, to take out six tickets at a time, that he should pay his shilling down and get his six tickets for the week; we say we do not mind that, you may take your ticket day by day. Again, we can require, under the Act, a certificate from his employer, saying that he is entitled to such a ticket, and we do not require such a certificate. Again, by the Act we need not let the workman return until after 6 o'clock in the evening, whereas we let him go back any day after 4 o'clock, and on Saturdays after 12 o'clock.

1489. Was it not the case that some few months ago an action was brought against the Great Eastern Railway Company by a working man who lived, I think, near Leyton. He walked into Stratford Station, took a return ticket to Liverpool-street and back, and in the evening when he wanted to go on by a certain train from Stratford to Leyton, not a workman's train, he had to pay again the whole fare from Liverpool-street to Leyton, and was not allowed to enjoy the advantage of the working man's return ticket?—I am not aware of the case to which you refer; it has never been before me. We do act most liberally in our interpretation of this working man's train question.

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1490. You told us that 2 *d.* for the fare does not pay the company; have you ever made any calculations as to the amount of the price of the tickets which would be required to make it pay the company?—I have thought of it more than once; and my notion is this, that the 2 *d.* for the return ticket should be 4 *d.*, and I think that if that could be granted, and we could be liberated from the obligation of bringing our workmen's trains into the Liverpool-street Station, and have the right to stop them at Bishopsgate Station instead, then the company would be quite prepared to consider the question of extending the system. At Bishopsgate the traffic that we carry is of a much lower class than that which we carry at Liverpool-street, and if we had power to stop our workmen's trains there, and start them thence, I have no doubt whatever that the directors would be prepared to incur a considerable expense at that station for their accommodation.

1491. Upon what lines do you propose to extend your operations?—That will have to be governed entirely by the circumstances that may be existing at the time.

1492. Talking about your different arrangements, do you think it would be possible to stop these working men's trains at your ticket-collecting platforms outside the stations?—We have no such ticket-collecting platforms nowadays: they have been abolished on our line for a long time.

1493. Do you let your trains run right into the main station?—We stop them at the station a little way out; we do not stop them at between stations for collecting the tickets; that was the old system in existence many years ago, but it is not in existence now.

1494. Have you found out from hearing the remarks between your officials and the workmen, whether the workmen like going out to the country and coming in every day to their work?—I have not heard any expression of opinion upon it.

1495. Can you tell me whether the houses which these people inhabit, when they get out to these places, have gardens attached to them?—The majority of those that I know have not, but no doubt there are many with gardens; they have got a little yard, which certainly could not be called a garden.

Chairman.

1496. You do not mean a garden that they could grow things in?—No, there is a little yard in which you see the washing hung out.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1497. Nothing that can be made into a vegetable garden?—No.

1498. Do you issue tickets for any length of time;

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

time; season tickets, or only for the week?—We tried some time ago an experiment in the issue of third-class season tickets between Walthamstow and London; ordinarily season tickets are first and second class only. We tried the experiment in connection with the workmen's question, but so few have been taken that we determined not to try the experiment further.

1499. Do these men take their tickets mostly by the week or by the day?—They are all taken by the day.

1500. I think you said that you did not find that these men give any trouble or annoyance to the officials, or to the railway officers for misconduct?—No, I should be sorry to say that; they are an intelligent, honest sort of men, but they still cause a large amount of annoyance to their fellow travellers.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1501. I understand you to say that your statutable obligations are entirely under your Railway Act?—Under a particular Act.

1502. And that you are not conscious, from your great experience, of ever having had to consider the application of that general Act, of which we have heard; the 1*d.*-a-mile Act?—I never heard the opinion expressed regarding it that has been expressed by the honourable Member.

1503. No doubt there is such an Act under the Standing Orders of the House of Lords. I was surprised to hear your attention called to it, but obviously from Edmonton, a distance of 9¾ miles, there would be no motive for either for you or the people to have that Act recalled from the dead, which would charge 1*d.* per mile?—No.

1504. In other words, general legislation is perfectly nugatory at present?—Yes, quite.

1505. Without complaining of your rivals in the carrying trade, do we understand that you think that it would be only fair that Parliament should impose a like obligation upon all the great railways coming into London?—Perhaps you would excuse my passing an opinion upon that question. I should like to get rid of the great annoyance we suffer.

1506. That annoyance you have told the Committee is in the direct ratio of your being the only railway subject to that strain?—If you would excuse my saying more upon that, I should be obliged.

1507. Now with regard to the aggregation of working men recently in these suburban districts, you think it has injured the neighbourhood as ground for the residents of the middle classes?—I do.

1508. And you think it has injured you as a railway company for the same reason?—I have no doubt that it has.

1509. Is it your opinion that, generally speaking, it is desirable for the community at large that these aggregations should be promoted and intensified; do you think it is desirable for their sakes, as well as yours?—Of course it is a very large question, and a question that must be dealt with, but I think the Great Eastern Railway Company has done its fair share in dealing with it.

1510. My question is rather as to the general

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

effect. If I understand you rightly, there is a collection which tends to form a slum, in many of these districts outside the ambit of the metropolis; people are aggregating there faster than the provision that ought to be made for them is made?—I should say that that was the case.

1511. As illustrating that fact, will you tell the Committee whether you know from observation, that these houses that are run up to provide for the demand of the outflow from the town, are cellared, or are they built upon the ground?—I do not think they are cellared.

1512. Then they are built upon the ground?—Yes; of course they have more or less foundation, and more or less the earth is removed from the bottom of the floor, but they are not cellared.

1513. There is no under story?—No.

1514. And there cannot be any adequate drainage?—I would rather a more practical man than myself spoke upon that subject.

1515. You told the honourable Member for Leominster that there are no provisions in most of these houses for gardens, which would employ a man or a boy in their leisure hours?—In the neighbourhood of Stamford Hill the houses put up for the working classes have no gardens.

1516. Stamford Hill is hardly a fair specimen; you would not say it was a specimen of what you have been talking of, because it is near to London, and is a rich neighbourhood, and land must be valuable there?—Yes, but I talk more especially about land lying west of Stamford Hill, and land lying down towards Tottenham and Edmonton. As you leave the hill itself the land decreases in value.

1517. That is not a particularly dry soil, is it?—It is a clay soil, otherwise it is dry.

1518. It requires drainage, peculiarly for health, does it not?—Yes.

1519. Do you know that a provision of a general kind has been made for the drainage of the houses in that district?—There is a local board of health in the neighbourhood, and I suppose they have required it.

1520. Has that board jurisdiction over the sewers?—I thought the sewers came within their jurisdiction.

1521. Are the sewers communicating with these poor people's habitations?—I do not know, but the sewers, I believe, come within the powers of the local board of health.

1522. I only wanted to know the fact?—I do not know that.

1523. If Parliament should be so advised as to impose a certain equal obligation on all great railways coming into London, do you suppose that a check might reasonably be anticipated to the outflow in your particular direction?—I think it is very likely, or rather I would put it in this way, that the increasing growth which is now going on, would be checked.

1524. Or perhaps varied?—I would rather put it the other way; I think the growth would be checked.

1525. You have mentioned that there are the ferry steamers, from South Woolwich to North Woolwich. Have you any other line of that kind?—No.

1526. There

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

1526. There is another line from Millwall Dock to Greenwich?—That is not ours.

1527. Have you ever contemplated taking over that line as part of your system?—I think it was talked of many years ago; but it has not been talked of for a long time.

1528. Have you contemplated making a tramway or steamway tunnel?—We have not contemplated it, but it has been talked of by other people.

1529. In communication with your line?—Advances have been made to us about it to know how far we would help it.

1530. What was the ground upon which the proposal of a tunnel under the river to Greenwich was made?—I do not know; it was not promoted by the Great Eastern Railway Company.

1531. Was it not done with a view to lessen the pressure of population amongst the dock labourers round in the workshops?—I do not know.

1532. Have you any doubt that the people would go across the river there, sooner than go a distance of 10 miles out of town?—I should think very likely.

1533. There is a great deal of ground unoccupied, comparatively speaking, on the south of the river, is there not?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the south to say.

1534. Do you propose to go to Parliament to be relieved from the pecuniary obligation of giving this outlet at 2*d.* a day? Is there any Bill before Parliament for that purpose?—No; we have no Bill before Parliament for that.

Mr. *Cropper.*

1535. How long has this state of things gone on with reference to your working men's trains?—I am sorry I am not able to answer that with accuracy, but it has been going on for seven years at least.

1536. Can you answer for seven years?—Yes.

1537. How much does it take off the men's day; what time are the men going to Edmonton, or the whole distance to Enfield?—The first train leaves there at two minutes to 5 o'clock in the morning, and it gets to Liverpool-street at 5.44, that is to say, it is 46 minutes on the road.

1538. Therefore it takes off his day about an hour and a half every day?—That is from Enfield to Liverpool-street and back.

1539. Do you find that that state of things is still increasing, that the number of men year by year increases, who take advantage of the system?—Yes, the number is increasing; it is a yearly increasing quantity, no doubt.

1540. Then I suppose your opinion is that the labouring people are happier living out of town; that there is some great inducement to make them prefer going out into the country, rather than to occupy places in town?—I imagine so, because they increase in number.

1541. Are they just the same class, as far as you can see, who go now, as those who went five years ago; your porters and others do not complain of their growing worse or rougher; they are just the same?—Yes.

1542. But the numbers are constantly increasing?—They are.

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

1543. Therefore you must have the impression that it suits them to go?—Yes.

1544. That is what makes you say you think that if the other railways were to have the same flow, the outgoing population would be still greater all round London?—I should say that it would be.

1545. And you have no reason to think that it is especially confined to your lines?—Provided the other lines offered the same facilities that we do, I have no doubt that they would get the workmen's traffic, but the companies would not appreciate it.

1546. And if it were not for your Act, you would not appreciate it?—No.

1547. It is your opinion that it is not a profitable form of traffic?—I am sure it is not, as far as the Great Eastern Company is concerned.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1548. Does the 42,000 that you speak of include all the workmen from every part of your line?—The whole of them; and I said, in answer to one honourable Member, that three-fourths of the whole go to Liverpool-street.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1549. Have you got any idea of the number of houses vacant in the districts along the line?—I have no information upon the subject.

Mr *Shaw Lefevre.*

1550. I suppose, although directly some harm may have been done to your railway by this obligation, yet indirectly you gain by the increase of building in the eastern parts?—The gain that we have derived as not recompensed us for the loss; I am sure of that.

1551. There has been a great increase of building of workmen's houses, has there not?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1552. Is there not a Bill before Parliament for your company to take additional land?—Yes.

1553. What is the extent of the land that you propose to take this year?—We are seeking powers to construct a new suburban railway from Edmonton to Cheshunt. I am speaking without book, but the distance is between five and six miles.

Chairman.

1554. Will the workmen's obligations apply to that line?—I hope not.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1555. I believe that land which you propose to take by that Bill this year, is partly covered by buildings, and partly not?—We have avoided the dwellings, the number we touch is small; but we are applying, in addition, for powers to lay down two more lines of railway.

Chairman.

1556. You have stated that in some cases you are bound by Parliament only to charge 2*d.*; you have also stated that in other cases where you are not bound, you have charged 4*d.*; have you found the workmen's traffic on those lines where you charge 4*d.* develope to the same extent as upon those lines where you can only charge 2*d.*?—Rateably, I should be disposed to say, speaking offhand, that the increase is the

Chairman—continued.

same, but the amount of traffic between the two districts is vastly different.

1557. What do you mean by that?—The total number going to the places to which we charge 4 *d.* is much below that coming to London from places where we charge 2 *d.*, but the rateable increase is as nearly as possible the same.

1558. You stated that this obligation was put upon you originally because you had a quantity of ground covered by workmen's houses, in the middle of London?—Yes.

1559. What was the displacement: can you tell us how many people you displaced when the obligation was put upon you?—I cannot say that, but I am sure we have rendered a very much larger amount of good to the working class than any harm that we did.

1560 Can you tell us what the acreage was?—No, but I can undertake to supply you with the information.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1561. And will you tell us how many families you displaced?—I will.

Chairman.

1562. Can you tell us when you send us the Paper, which will be put in as part of your evidence, the area of the displacement, the number of families displaced, and when you did displace them, whether you displaced them all in a moment, or how you displaced them, and the amount of compensation?—Yes; it shall be handed to you.

1563. And if you could add to the Paper any information of what became of the people after they were displaced, we shall be glad?—If it is possible to get that information, I will give it to you.

Mr. Frederick William Goddard, re-called; and further Examined.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1564. What do you desire to put in?—These are the statements of where the people, in the improvements of Sun-street to Worship-street, went to: the houses they took, and the rents they paid. (*The Witness handed in the statement.*)

1565. Will you state the obligation imposed by the Street Improvements Act, 1872, upon the Metropolitan Board of Works?—Yes, we were obliged to re-house 1,457 persons displaced, namely, 182 in Wapping, in the High-street, Shoreditch, 311; in the Shoreditch Improvement, that was what was termed the Great Eastern Street, 566; in the Old-street to Oxford-street 348; and in the Harrow-road Improvement, 50.

1566. You have had a good deal of experience with the Metropolitan Board of Works, with reference to these street improvements; is it not the first time in your knowledge that anything so stringent has been put upon the Board?—The first time that we were obliged to do this, was in the Act of 1872; prior to that no imposition was placed upon the Board.

1567. Is it not much more stringent than anything which has been placed upon any railway company, or upon any other company?—I have here all the enactments placed upon the railway companies in the cases of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, the London and Blackwall Railway, the Great Northern Railway, and all the metropolitan railways, and I find in no instance is there any such imposition placed upon them as is placed upon us, except in the case of the Midland Railway in 1876 and 1878.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

1568. What sections do you refer to in the Act of 1872 that are more stringent than any conditions put upon other people?—Sections 48 and 49.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1569. As the honourable Member has asked that question, will you read those sections?—"The Board shall, not less than eight weeks before they take in any parish 15 houses, or more, occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, make known their intention to take the same by placards and bills, or other general notice placed in public view upon such houses, and the Board shall not take any such houses until they shall have obtained the certificate of a justice that it has been proved to his satisfaction that the Board have made known their intention to take the same in manner hereinbefore required." "And whereas the making of the street improvements, in this Act referred to as the Wapping Improvements, the Shoreditch Improvements," and so on.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

1570. Can you put in a table with reference to these sites, stating how often they were advertised, and the steps which we took?—Clerkenwell-road was first advertised in February 1879; the valuation of the architect was 360 *l.* per annum; there were two offers made in March 1879, of 252 *l.*, and another of 300 *l.* respectively. The 300 *l.* was withdrawn, and the 252 *l.* the Board did not accept; but in May 1880 they accepted an offer of 300 *l.*, and the building is now nearly finished, and the tenements will be ready shortly for occupation. These are Nos. A. to G.; plot B. is Clerkenwell-road.

1571. Some of them had to be varied on account of their curious shapes, and you had to wait and come to Parliament, and get leave to alter them, so that they might be more applicable to the purposes?—The Home Secretary gave us leave; I may say that now the whole of these sites have been let (the last two were sold out and out), and the buildings are upon seven out of the nine sites.

1572. The Metropolitan Board were less stringent in the case of the last two in consequence of the recommendations of this Committee last year?—That is so.

Chairman.

1573. What is the meaning of the last words in that proviso: "Provided always that if at any time

Chairman—continued.

time within three years after the Board have acquired any of the before-mentioned plots of land a Secretary of State shall so determine, or at the expiration of such three years the Board shall have been unable to sell or let the same for the purpose aforesaid, the obligations by this enactment imposed upon the Board shall with respect to the land so unsold or let cease and determine"?—Upon that if we were unable to let them for the purpose provided in the Act we could sell them for commercial uses.

1574. Then what have you to complain of?—We do not complain of the Act of 1872; it is the Acts of 1877 and 1879 that we complain of.

1575. There is no complaint under the 1872 Act?—No, we only state how we have dealt with it.

1576. But you say the Act of 1872 was more stringent than any Act put upon any railway?—The Act of 1872 was the first Act imposing any obligation upon the Board, and it was more stringent than that which was imposed upon the railways, because in the Act of 1872 there was a specific site, or there were specific sites set apart to be devoted to certain purposes, the Acts imposing upon the railway company only that they should see that sufficient provision was given for the parties displaced; and we think that in that return of the Sun-street to Worship-street improvement, that imposition, the same as the railways, was carried out in its integrity, and fully answered its purpose.

1577. Have the railway companies this saving clause, about being able to sell at the end of three years?—I do not know that they have that.

1578. That is a great advantage to you, is it not?—It is a great advantage in this way; if we put it in force; we put the sites into the market for artizans' purposes, and the Board have devoted every site to the purpose which Parliament provided, and they have not sought to use it for commercial purposes.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1579. Wishing to carry out the Act in its integrity?—Yes.

1580. Leaving the Act of 1872, will you state the obligations in the Act of 1877?—The Act of 1877 provides for the re-imposing of 10,129 persons.

1581. By what section?—The 33rd section. In the two streets running from Piccadilly to Bloomsbury, and from Charing-cross to Oxford-street, there were 5,497 persons. These are the parties returned as dwelling in the houses at the time of the passing of the Act. In the Gray's Inn-road there are 1,725 persons; in the Kentish Town improvement 265 persons; in the Tooley-street improvement 860 persons; in the Southwark Bridge-road 1,622; that is the scene of the late apprehension for murder; in the Jamaica-road improvement there were 104 persons; in the Camberwell and Peckham improvement 38 persons; and in the Deptford Bridge improvement 18 persons. (*The Witness produced a map.*) On this map you see coloured in red all those houses that are more or less occupied by what are termed artizans, persons holding weekly lodgings. The piece coloured blue is that piece which we,

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

in our judgment, set aside for the re-imposition of a portion of those, and we can house upon those two sites 1,470 out of the 5,400 that we are obliged to accommodate, according to the statement made just now. We have a place in Pye-street, Westminster, of which the excess of accommodation over that dispossessed is sufficient for 600 more, and I stated, as regards that, that the Peabody trustees were prepared to receive evidence of these people coming out, and to give them the first opportunity of going in. I need not point out to you the difficulty that the Board would have under that section, which says they shall not remove 15 houses before they have provided adequate accommodation for the parties dispossessed. This is a very congery of weekly lettings, and I may state respectfully to this Committee that under this investigation I thought it my duty to do what I do not ordinarily do. If I go into a house, and the condition of its ground floor satisfies me as to the general condition of the house, I am able to value it without going into every room, because the state of some of the rooms is anything but what it should be; and it does not allure you to go in. But the other day I valued for the Board the property between Rupert-street and Macclesfield-street, up as far Nassau-street, down to Rupert-street. I went into every house that I had to deal with, and when I tell you that the people are paying 5 *s.* and 5 *s.* 6 *d.* for single rooms, that they are in a dilapidated and wretched state, that the sanitary condition of the house is inconceivable; that they have one water closet for 10 families; I do not think it is a state that even looking at it in a sanitorial point of view, is beneficial to the population of London; and that the removal of this would not only aid in making a great arterial communication which should be effected, but a healthy alteration.

Chairman.

1582. We are all agreed upon that, but we want now to discuss your particular grievance in the Act, and how you propose to get over it?—The difficulty is the difficulty of removal; if we are kept to moving 15 houses at a time I shall not live to see the end of it.

1583. With regard to the blue parts, No. 1 and No. 2, which are both set apart for reconstruction by you, are they at all cleared at the present moment, or are there houses on them?—We are about purchasing the interests and shutting them up, and clearing them. We have the authority of the Home Secretary to clear this block.

1584. And how soon could buildings be erected upon these two plots?—We can only build upon one; we are obliged to keep one in hand, until the other is covered.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1585. Is it not the case, that that is the only spot in the whole of this improvement that we are allowed to clear?—Yes.

Chairman.

1586. Supposing that you are allowed to clear both No. 1 and No. 2 at once, how soon could you

Chairman—continued.

get buildings put upon either one or other of the plots?—It would take a twelvemonth to cover the one.

1587. You think it could be done in twelve months?—Yes; that is twelve months from the time the buildings are all down.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1588. Are you going to build yourselves?—That is a matter that I cannot express an opinion upon.

1589. Have you any power?—No, we have no building power.

Chairman.

1590. Do you think you could let those two plots for buildings?—They will be put into the market at once, and under such terms that possibly they might be taken.

1591. If that was done, and the moment one of these spots was recovered, or both recovered, you were allowed to proceed with your improvements as rapidly as you could, would that satisfy your views?—I think it would, if there was no restriction put upon the Board as to the removal of the remainder of the houses if, when those two plots were covered, the Board were allowed to remove the remainder of those houses without restriction upon the two several lines of improvements, it would remove the difficulties affecting those street improvements.

1592. Am I right in believing that these two plots, coloured blue, are the only plots set apart by the Act for the habitations for working men?—On that improvement certainly.

1593. Therefore, what would practically satisfy you would be that these two plots should be cleared at once, and be built upon, and the moment that was done, you would be allowed to go on with the improvement?—Yes, the same as an ordinary improvement without the restriction of the 33rd section.

1594. How many people would be housed on No. 1 and on No. 2?—1,470.

1595. And then you have to add to that 600, that is 2,070?—Yes; I may tell you this, that the 5,497 includes the artizans in every house scheduled within the limits of deviation, and it is not the intention, nor was it the intention of the Board, to take all houses within that schedule; and therefore it might be reduced some thousands. I wanted to do that before the House, when it was passed, but they insisted that we should put in our schedule everybody within the limits of deviation.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1596. There are other sites which the Committee would like to see; those are two, and there are two more which Section 33 specially affects?—The Gray's Inn-road is the next most important.

Chairman.

1597. That was the one you were referring to, the Western Improvement Scheme?—Yes.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1598. Now as to the Gray's Inn-road site, will you give the Committee the particulars of that?—We have to accommodate 1,725 individuals; all those coloured red on that map are where the artizans live; all the land coloured blue is all the land appropriated by Parliament for the re-housing of the parties disturbed. Now I may say that the Gray's Inn-road is one of the most important of the communications of the Metropolis from north to south; that the land in Gray's Inn-road will, when that improvement is made, if it can be utilised for commercial purposes, be of very great value; and if you were to go to the right-hand side of that plan, the little place that is not devoted to artizans' dwellings, close to the Holborn end, when I tell you that I have let that land for 2*s.* 6*d.* per foot super, and that we do not anticipate at the highest getting more than 3*d.* a foot for the land devoted to artizans' dwellings, the one commanding, perhaps, a recoupment value of 27 years' purchase as ground rent in the market, and the other subject to a very doubtful result, I need not say what the loss will be; that the recoupment upon that area will be minimised so much that it is almost inappreciable.

1599. Is it not the fact that if we were subject to the stringency of the 33rd section, we should be obliged to devote nearly the whole of the frontage of Gray's Inn-road to artizans' dwellings?—Yes, except that little bit at the end.

1600. Can you give an idea of the aggregate loss to the ratepayers from it?—It would be a loss of some 300,000*l.*, I should think.

Chairman.

1601. What is your proposition with reference to the Gray's Inn-road improvement?—The proposition is this, that we should be able to satisfy any magistrate, or the Home Secretary, if need be, that these parties who are dispossessed had been enabled to find other lodgings, suitable to their requirements; that we should compensate them in the same way as we have done those on the Sun-street to Worship-street improvement, namely, giving them a small sum upon the outset of their inquiry, and a further sum when they have reported to us where they are located; and when their lodgings have been approved by the Board, and the authority to whom the Board is subject, that a tabulated statement should be kept of their former occupation and the holding that they had, and so on, and the holding which they have now taken; a great many of these people that are in the return of 1,725 are congregated 13 or 14 on one floor, and perhaps there are 30 people in a house.

1602. Then you propose, in this scheme, absolutely to do nothing for them?—We propose to leave them to find their accommodation.

1603. Your proposition is that you should be wholly released from the obligation of building anything?—We have a piece of ground which we purchased in Red Lion-yard; that will accommodate 300, and it will be devoted to artizans' dwellings.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1604. You propose having artizans' dwellings erected there for a portion of these people?—Yes.

1605. You

Chairman.

1605. You propose to provide houses for 300 out of how many?—Out of 1,750; we propose that other sites might be obtained in the outskirts of the metropolis, where dwelling accommodation is cheaper, and where railway transit can be had; you know this is a very migratory population; this is a population the greater part of which, in the hop season, is all gone from there; they are all down hopping in Kent.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1606. Have you ascertained what proportion find employment now within a reasonable distance of where they are living?—No; but I have a schedule of the trade of every occupant in the place.

1607. Could you obtain that?—Yes.

1608. Giving how many are occupied within half-a-mile or a mile?—Yes.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1609. Have the Board, as far as they possibly can, within the limits of the Act, taken all the interest in these streets?—We have advertised to find places where we could replace these people that we turn out; we put an advertisement in in December 1879, and we got a few replies, but very few; we also re-advertised in December 1881, and in order that they should not suppose that there was anything in connection with the Metropolitan Board of Works, we advertised through an independent surveyor; and the result was that we got only one site that was at all fit, and that was a site in Kentish Town, which the Board are now about purchasing.

1610. You have another scheme, what is your third scheme?—I do not know whether there is any other of such importance as the two schemes which I have put before you. In Tooley-street we have, by the authority of the Home Secretary, substituted a site called Pickled Herring Wharf, of which you have heard, and while we have to accommodate 860 people in Tooley-street, we have put there accommodation for 1,000. Then we are in excess in Jamaica-road, where we have to accommodate 104; we have put a site accommodating 200, and in Camberwell and Peckham, where we have 38 people to accommodate, we have put a site to accommodate 100; therefore, in all those cases we have given more than the Legislature demands of us; the only other improvement that we have to deal with, as far as artizans are concerned, is the main communication from Southwark Bridge-road to St. George's Church in the Borough; we call it the Southwark and Great Dover-street communication; in that you see all the property that the Board can acquire, save a very small portion at the commencement, is devoted to artizans' dwellings. All the blue is devoted to artizans' dwellings.

Chairman.

1611. What do you want here?—We want nothing; we only want to be relieved from the necessity of not taking down more than 16 houses; we want to be able to make the street thoroughly, and I may tell you that this is the abode of the very lowest class; even the felonious class of London, and that the last apprehension for burglary and murder took place there.

Chairman—continued.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*

1612. Is it not the case, in your experience, that it is impossible that the Board can carry out the improvement if the 33rd section remains in the statute?—I have here some remarks which I will read. The objections to the 33rd section are twofold: first, that it allocates for labourers' dwellings some of the most valuable land in the metropolis, as, for instance, the lands coloured blue, being frontages in Gray's Inn-lane; and, secondly, that the proviso as to removal of 15 houses practically prevents the execution of the improvements where many of the labouring class are to be displaced. It is quite true, as Mr. Torrens pointed out, in his examination of Mr. Reid, that if the Secretary of State were so disposed, he might approve of the re-location of the labouring classes on other lands than the lands coloured blue; but the whole tenor of the Board's communication to the Home Office has been to the effect that the other lands referred to must be lands not distant from the improvement from which the labouring classes are to be displaced; and in fact, the Secretary of State has not only required that the Board should obtain sites near the improvements, but should also obtain the erection thereon of labourers' dwellings, to which the Board should be able to point before obtaining leave to remove more than 15 houses. I may say that in Camberwell some houses have been left as they were, and not been able to be removed, though the people have gone out for a year and a half, till the houses got into that state that they fell down themselves; the Board is therefore governed, not so much by the actual wording of the proviso, as by the application of it adopted at the Home Office. It has been proved in the evidence that it is quite impossible for the Board to obtain sites within a short distance of the street improvements, and if they could there would still remain the question, whether they could secure the erection of buildings for the accommodation of the persons displaced. No doubt, if the Secretary of State would permit the Board to buy sites at Stratford, West Ham, Tottenham, or other outlying districts, the Board might secure the erection of artizans' dwellings; but, on the other hand, it is notorious that there are in those localities abundant labourers' dwellings already. The interpretation put by the Home Office upon the 33rd section is shown by a letter from Mr. Godfrey Lushington, dated 28th June 1880. It is also shown by the letter from the Home Office, dated 19th December 1879, in which it is said, "In his opinion it is (that is the opinion of Mr. Secretary Cross) essential that in these street improvements, the first step should be to provide houses for the working classes, to which those who are displaced belong; the next to carry out the improvements. If, therefore, he is now to be called on to release the Board completely from the statutory restriction, he must require not only that the whole of the substituted sites (with such addition as may be necessary to cause them to be sufficient)

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

sufficient) should be cleared, but that the houses should be erected thereon, and made fit for occupation, before the rest of the land is cleared for improvements; or if the Board prefer to proceed by stages, he will be willing to consider an arrangement whereby successive portions of the land may be cleared as soon in each case as houses have been erected on other sites sufficient to provide for a number equal to the number displaced." I may add that practically the Home Office seems to require that the persons actually displaced shall be provided for by the Board in new dwellings, but the Act does not seem to prescribe this, and it is well known that many of the occupants displaced would not go into the new buildings if requested to do so. This is the letter which I shall put in, "Whitehall, 28th June 1880,—Sir, I am directed by the Secretary of State to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, on the subject of the removal of the houses between Green Bank and Stoney-lane for the purposes of the Tooley-street improvement, and I am to acquaint you, in reply, for the information of the Metropolitan Board of Works, that in the opinion of the Secretary of State, the enactment requires, that in the absence of special exemption from the Secretary of State, the Board should, before pulling down 15 houses, provide accommodation for the number displaced; such accommodation to be in addition to that which otherwise exists, so that the demolition of the houses will not cause any diminution in the accommodation of the district for the working classes. I am, &c. (signed) *Godfrey Lushington.*—The Clerk to the Metropolitan Board of Works."

1613. You have some Papers to put in showing the different sections in the different railway companies Acts, and showing the difference between the 33rd section and those sections?—Yes. (*The same were delivered in.*)

Chairman.

1614. You agree that the last letter of the Home Secretary, Sir William Harcourt, is proper construction of the Act of Parliament?—That is the construction put upon it by the Home Office, and I presume we must bow to that construction.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1615. Have you any observations to make with reference to the suggestion of the honourable Member for Finsbury, that it is the duty of the Board to appropriate vacant building sites, not devoted, by Act of Parliament, to the erection of labourers' dwellings?—I have sketched out this: I am informed that the Board have no authority to let such lands under their full market value, and the suggestion of the honourable Member could not therefore be lawfully carried into effect by the Board. The Board, I find, by purview of its Act of Parliament, passes each successive scheme. I would, however, observe, that even if Parliament thought fit to give the Board the necessary powers, it is not probable that even one per cent. of the labourers, displaced from the slums in Gray's Inn-road, would become

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

occupiers of the new houses when erected. I would further point out that the labouring-class tenants would never become more than weekly tenants, and even if, therefore, the Board insisted upon their being located in the new buildings, it is almost certain that within a few weeks they would be ousted by the landlord, so as to make way for more desirable tenants. It seems to me also worthy of remark that the funds at the disposal of the Board are raised by rates, which, directly or indirectly, are paid by the poorest, as well as the wealthier classes; and to tax the poorest classes for the purpose of erecting dwellings to be occupied by persons above them in social position and in means, seems a matter of questionable expediency. If the principles enunciated by the honourable Member are sound, it would, I presume, follow that the Board should accommodate the labouring classes on the western improvements in Northumberland Avenue, much of which is still uncovered. This would result in the sale of the land for about a fortieth of its market value.

1616. Have you any other observation to make with reference to the 33rd section, which cramps the Metropolitan Board of Works in all their improvements, or with reference to the working of the general Act; which I have not asked you about, or forgotten to ask?—I think the observations which I have previously made, especially upon the western improvement, have shown in what light I regard the 33rd section.

Mr. *William Holms.*

1617. With regard to your first scheme, the Southwark and Great Dover-street scheme, how many people are displaced?—I think about 1,622.

1618. How many do you propose to provide for?—We propose to accommodate the whole.

1619. You stated that, as far as regards the second scheme, that is the Gray's Inn-road scheme, the ground was of great commercial value?—I have given an instance of the amount we have let already in that portion not devoted to artizans' dwellings.

1620. Is it your opinion that it would be better, in connection with all these improvements, if you had full power to use the ground, when cleared, for any purpose?—I think so.

1621. Then, in the event of your doing so, do you think the working classes, as a rule, would find no difficulty in getting house accommodation within a reasonable distance from the place where they are dispossessed?—I think they are better able to obtain it than we are to find it for them, and I do not think there will be much difficulty in their obtaining it.

1622. Do I understand that, as a rule, so far as you can, you give accommodation in the places that are cleared from houses where the land is not particularly valuable, as you have done in the third scheme?—Yes.

1623. You endeavour, where the ground is not valuable, to give as much accommodation as you possibly can?—That has been the desire of the Board.

1624. As

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1624. As to the Act of 1872, have all the improvements authorised by that Act been carried out?—Yes, every one.

1625. Did not you say that the Clerkenwell site was first put up for letting in 1879?—The Clerkenwell-road site was first advertised in February 1879.

1626. That had an area of 21,600 feet?—Yes.

1627. Can you account for it not having been advertised before the Act was passed in 1872, and for the improvement only being begun in 1879?—I can give you the reason for that.

1628. What was it?—That is the site in Liquorpond-street. It has been a moot point with the Board whether they should prosecute before Parliament a street improvement running from the corner of Liquorpond-street to the Angel at Islington. They did apply once to Parliament for that purpose, but they stopped short at Exmouth-street. The Committee thought it was not a mature scheme, and they struck it out. That was part of our Gray's Inn-road application in 1877, and they rejected that portion of the scheme; but it has always been in the eyes of the Board desirable to carry out that street. The question was, whether they should take that piece of land between Laystall-street and Liquorpond-street to provide an entrance to the very street in question. It is to be considered by the Board, at their July meeting this year, whether they will go to Parliament in the ensuing Session to prosecute that street; hence there was some little difficulty in dealing with this portion of the Artizans' Dwelling Appropriation, by reason of the question whether we should take this street, cutting a portion of it up, or leave it in its entirety.

1629. So that it was not the provisions of the Act of 1872 which prevented their prosecuting that improvement earlier?—No.

1630. With reference to this Act, you spoke of the 48th section, as to notice to be given for taking houses of the labouring classes. This section only provides that you are to give notice eight weeks beforehand, when you take the houses, so that that does not seriously stand in the way?—I do not complain seriously of that section. I say that the 1872 was the first scheme in which we had any imposition thrown upon us to re-house the working classes; that is all; and the appropriation of certain sites upon our plans has that specific object. I am not complaining of the notice, or the magisterial requisition, or anything of that kind.

1631. With reference to the Act of 1877, when was the last communication with the Home Office; you read the communication that took place in June 1880?—The last communication with the Home Office is that relative to Tooley-street, which has been put aside until further progress has been made in the correspondence.

1632. You quoted the opinion of the Secretary of State as to the alternative provided in the 33rd section?—Yes.

1633. You alluded to his opinion as being that the other land must be in the proximity of those taken?—Yes.

1634. What is the date of that opinion from the Home Office?—That is 1880.

1635. That was not since the report of this Committee last year?—No, it was prior to that.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1636. Have you in any of these schemes had any experience of the plan of giving money to these persons displaced?—Not in this scheme. In the Sun-street to Worship-street scheme we had, and the scheme of 1872, we compensated every individual who was displaced, giving them from 1 *l.* to 3 *l.* and 4 *l.* if they had been in occupation a little time; and a little more to people who had anything like a chandler's shop or a little business.

1637. Do you think they prefer that system to having new houses found for them?—Yes, I am certain that the opposition of the lower classes of the population to rehousing in any better houses than those which they sprung from, is very strong and most difficult to overcome.

1638. Could those persons who were so displaced, and received money, find any better habitations for themselves?—They went within half-a-mile of that neighbourhood, to a place called Willow-walk, which led out of Great Eastern-street, out of Bunhill-row, and that way; they went into Old-street, and north of Old-street-road.

1639. Were those houses very much better than the houses they came from?—Infinitely better.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1640. Your clearance, under the Act of 1872, of the ground necessary to make Clerkenwell-road, necessarily drove a large portion of the population into the surrounding districts, I presume?—Yes, I have no doubt it did.

1641. What is the total length?—We did not take much depth, we only took frontage.

1642. But you took a great length?—Yes.

1643. And there was little room for the people in the surrounding district, apart from the question of clearing away Baldwin's-gardens?—All we took away was 348 people from Old-street to Oxford-street, which we called No. 1 improvement. I have spoken of No. 2 as Shoreditch. In that one improvement, the widening of High-street, and what is now Great Eastern-street, we had 311; the other portion of Shoreditch, including Bethnal Green, was 516; and in Clerkenwell, Theobald's-road, which is termed Old-street, towards Oxford-street, which was the name of the improvement, 348; those are the whole of the artizans and labourers we dispossessed.

1644. When you came to struggle with the difficulties of Clause 33, do I understand that you found yourself face to face with these impediments; that if you began to pull down any, excepting Baldwin's Gardens and Gray's Inn-road, you could not have got sites on which to build suitable dwellings, such as was the contemplation of Sir Richard Cross, in the House of Commons?—It would be practically impracticable. With 15 houses we can only remove 15 houses at a time; taking 15 houses in Baldwin's Gardens, the area is so small that we cannot deal with it.

1645. How did it happen that while you could not do this, the thing was done?—By whom?

1646. We shall find that by-and-bye; are you aware that workmen's dwellings have been put up on a considerable scheme, and with great advantage,

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

advantage in this very district, which you could not deal with since the existence of that clause of which you complain?—You give me information I was not aware of until you told me.

1647. Was it ever brought under your knowledge that the landlords of that district, being conscious of the deplorable state of the houses, surrendered the sites which were theirs in fee, for the purpose of encouraging that building, which you say could not be put up?—I am very glad to hear it.

1648. Did you ever hear that Lord Leigh had property in that district?—Yes.

1649. Do you know that Lord Leigh has contributed in that way to the erection of buildings, which are now to be seen by anyone who likes to look at them, that they are occupied by workmen?—I receive the information, and am very grateful to Lord Leigh for his philanthropic idea.

1650. Do you known Mr. Hubbard has property there?—No.

1651. Do you know that Mr. Hubbard gave an endowment for St. Alban's?—I know Mr. Hubbard is not in my reference-book.

1652. You do not know that the people themselves, being left to themselves and their own enterprise, have put up buildings to replace the want partly created by the public pulling down of houses under the Act of 1879?—No; but if that is so, of course I take your word. I can only say it seems singular that when the advertisements were placed out, and when they knew the desire of the Board to acquaint themselves with any sites that might be substituted, the propositions that sprang from the philanthropic heart of Lord Leigh should not have been laid before the Board, or that the disposition of Mr. Hubbard should not have enabled him to come to us, but we have had no communication with either of them.

1653. But you think that the Board can best provide for the future welfare of these poor people by letting them find places for themselves?—I think that is the most practical way of looking at it.

1654. It has been stated more than once, in the Committee, that there was room for 600 or 700 in Pye-street?—Yes.

1655. Pye-street is near this place?—Yes.

1656. What is the distance between Baldwin's Gardens and Pye-street?—I look more to accommodate our western improvement than the Gray's Inn-lane improvement, as regards Pye-street, because the distance from Newport Market and that neighbourhood to Pye-street is comparatively small.

1657. How far is it?—About half-a-mile or three-fourths of a mile at the outset.

1658. Has it come under your notice, in making your surveys for the Board, that several large employers, finding the destitution of better houses under recent legislation, have begun to build for themselves, and have bought up property for the purpose of building?—Yes; there was a disposition on the part of Messrs. Reed to take the Liquorpond site, to accommodate the entirety of their artizans, and so forth.

1659. After you cleared it?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

1660. But before the clearances have been made, are you aware that large firms, in different parts of the town contiguous to where we have been discussing, have made large improvements of that kind?—I have heard of some large firms, large upholstering firms and others, who have taken houses in the immediate contiguity of their shops, for the purposes of housing those employed upon their premises.

1661. You know where Crosse & Blackwell's works are?—Yes.

1662. Are you aware that they are building up houses, and re-building them, to accommodate their people?—I heard they were attempting to do it, but whether they have succeeded I do not know.

1663. Did you hear that Combe, Delafield, & Company have done it?—Yes.

1664. Do you know to what extent?—No.

1665. Would not it be worth inquiring?—If you think so, I shall be willing to do so; it has never been delegated to me to make the inquiries.

1666. Have you heard of Messrs. Stedall, the iron people, doing the same?—I have heard of them, but I do not know anything of them.

1667. All these employers whom I have named can contrive to find these sites upon which to build?—Sites of any importance?

1668. Yes, of very great importance?—I will make inquiries.

1669, I will call to your attention a street called Newcastle-street, which abuts upon Delafield's brewery, where a whole street has been rebuilt by the brewery?—I apprehend that private individuals can do that which the Metropolitan Board of Works as a body would fail to accomplish. I know that you can buy, as a private individual, at a lower rate than when it is publicly announced.

1670. I should like to join issue with you about that; you say they can do it to greater advantage than a public body; by that you mean a body armed with legislative power?—That is with compulsory power.

1671. I am referring to cases of compulsory power; are you aware that it has been asserted in Parliament that Combe, Delafield & Company found that they were so salted by the private owners of the tumble-down houses, that they staggered at the attempt, and that they allowed a Member of the House of Commons to represent that their difficulty was that they were doing it at an enomous loss, and that under the powers of arbitration they would have taken those places at their value, whereas they were put at an excessive price by the exaction of the private owners?—I was speaking of where a private owner looks round to find property in the market, where there is a voluntary seller and a voluntary buyer. When there is a willing seller and a willing buyer, a purchase can be effected at a cheaper rate than where a Board is empowered to take compulsory, because where a man has property taken from his control, without his authority or acquiescence, he naturally expects some honorarium for it.

1672. I think you told the Chairman at the beginning of your examination that these hard lines

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

lines of Clause 33 were such as were never imposed before by Act of Parliament?—That is so, or in any Act that I have seen, except in the case of the Midland Railway Company's Act of 1877 and 1878.

1673. Just to refresh your memory, have you never heard that one of the greatest works in London was authorised by Parliament in the very terms that the poor people displaced should be replaced to the extent of 2,000 inhabitants?—Which Act was that?

1674. The Act which authorised the City to make the Holborn Viaduct.—That is not given to me as one of them. I was speaking of the Railway Acts, and I have the whole of them here; that is not a Railway Act, and it does not come within my notice.

Mr. *Cropper.*

1675. I think you said, with regard to the Gray's Inn-road, if you were obliged to use it and build up those common dwellings, you would lose over 300,000 *l.*?—I said that off hand; it is as 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per foot is, for commercial purposes, to 3 *d.* per foot for artizan purposes.

1676. You said there were only 1,725 people going to be displaced?—Yes.

1677. That is something over 300 families?—Yes.

1678. And if we put them together, it looks like a loss to the town of 1,000 *l.* a family to house these people?—If my calculation be correct.

1679. It is a *reductio ad absurdum*?—Yes.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

1680. With reference to the Act of 1872, I understand you to say that the obligation of the Board was to cease after three years, and you have made no use of the proviso?—No.

1681. As a matter of fact, were all the plots of land acquired by the Board sold or let before the expiration of three years?—The first is in 1879; in Great Eastern-street we had cleared and advertised as early as 1876, and that was substituted by a piece of ground in Apole-street after being advertised several times, which substituted piece of ground I take at 5 *d.* per foot.

1682. Your Board could have availed themselves of this proviso if they felt so inclined?—Yes.

1683. But they thought that they were acting in accordance with the spirit of the Act by not availing themselves of the proviso?—Yes, they kept to the directions of the Act.

1684. As I understand, with reference to the 33rd section of the Act of 1877, you would desire to see another Act, amending that Act, introduced by the Secretary of State to release the Board from the special conditions of Section 33, if he were satisfied that the persons displaced were properly housed elsewhere?—I have said that, with reference to the western improvement, where we have accommodated 2,000 out of the number, that upon rebuilding upon those sites, if no restriction were imposed upon the Board, the Board would be satisfied as to that, but with reference to the Gray's Inn-road, if any suitable accommodation could be provided, either by sites in the immediate locality,

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

or by extending the area within three miles, we may say, and proving to the Secretary of State that the accommodation had been provided, then the Board could be at liberty to proceed with it, and deal with the land in a commercial way.

1685. When you say accommodation provided, do you mean that the Board are to provide the accommodation by building suitable dwellings?—I mean, if we show that suitable dwellings are there, whether built by the Board or anybody else, or that accommodation has been found in places. For instance, I think it was the suggestion of one of the honourable Members that we should have a return showing how far distant each of these people's business premises was from their present location.

1686. We had evidence before us that in the opinion of one witness, at all events, there would be no real difficulty in making arrangements with a great number of these displaced persons, to find them suitable dwellings elsewhere, not built by the Board, but existing dwellings; you would be satisfied if the Secretary of State were enabled to allow the Board to go on with the improvement schemes, if he were satisfied that such accommodation had been found?—Yes.

1687. That would practically meet your difficulty with regard to the 33rd section?—Yes.

1688. Your second difficulty is with regard to the limit of 15 houses?—Yes.

1689. That, to a certain extent, would be removed by the amendment I have pointed out?—Yes.

1690. But take the Act as it is; supposing it is determined to keep the principles of the 33rd section, would it remove your objection at all if the limit of 15 houses were extended, say, to 50 or 60 houses?—No, I do not think it would remove our objection, because we should have extreme difficulty in keeping those houses up after we have obtained possession of them. Anybody having had experience of dealing with houses that are tenanted by the class that I am referring to, what is termed the artizan class, knows that, after the Board gets possession, they think they are entitled to pay no rent. In the second place, we have great difficulty in keeping them in decent condition; a great of material, such as lead and other things, disappear, and further we have complaints that these houses, being shut up, deteriorate the next houses, and is a great disadvantage to the shopkeepers; so that, unless we have the power of removing them in their entirety, we have a set of dilapidated buildings, standing facing the main street, and injuring our dealing with the property adjoining.

1691. Then you think that, practically, no benefit would be gained by extending the limit from 15 to 60 houses, if the rest of the section remains the same?—I would respectfully say that nothing but getting rid of that section in its entirety will enable the Board to carry out its improvements in a proper manner.

1692. You said that as matters now stand you would have to allocate the valuable part of the land in the Gray's Inn-lane, that is, all the part facing the street, to artizans' dwellings?—Yes.

1693. The land fronting the street would of course be most valuable, would it not therefore answer the purpose of the Board to purchase some

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

some of the land at the back of the land fronting the street, and build there, keeping the front, which is valuable for the building of shops?—I hardly think we have sufficient depth for that purpose; the depth is not more than 100 feet in any one place, and you must have from 50 to 60 feet, to build anything like shops or mercantile premises upon.

1694. It amounts to this, does it not, that you would have to come to Parliament to get larger powers?—Undoubtedly.

1695. Still, assuming that you get the larger powers, might it not, practically, pay the Board to get those powers, and get the additional land to build there, leaving the front, which is the valuable part, for shops?—By restricting the area to accommodate the individuals dispossessed you would be powerless to put them there, because you would not have a sufficient area, unless you went eight or ten stories high, to re-house the same number of inhabitants; they are so densely packed in these places.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1696. Taking the land in Gray's Inn-lane, where the widest limit of deviation is, would it not be possible there to act upon the suggestion of the honourable Member for Midhurst, and sell the frontage for commercial purposes, leaving the back premises to be built upon for artizans' dwellings?—Where you have a depth of 160 feet run in Tyndall's Buildings' block it might be done, but in some parts you have only a little over 100 feet, and 60 feet, and 80 feet, and 120 feet.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1697. Have you made allowance for the street being made wider?—Yes.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1698. I gather from your evidence, that unless you leave a frontage of from 60 to 100 feet, and unless the limit of deviation is considerably beyond that, you cannot recoup yourself in the way proposed?—We must have 100 feet for mercantile premises, and we must leave an area between the back of the premises, and the next set of buildings; and that area cannot be less than 30 feet, so that we practically have nothing at the back in some parts.

1699. Supposing you sold the land for commercial purposes, would you recoup the whole of the cost of the scheme?—No; the evidence I gave was that the cost was about 75 per cent., allowing for interest and all.

1700. Not even supposing you sell it for commercial purposes?—No; our general expectation is that if we realise one third of the cost, it is very good, we lost 67 per cent.

1701. And you calculate upon that loss, even in the Gray's Inn-lane scheme?—We have one exceptional instance in the Northumberland Avenue. We had 3½ acres of uncovered ground; there was no interest to purchase there, and in that case we shall get out with a small loss of 10 or 15 per cent.

1702. But in Gray's Inn-lane, supposing you are not able to sell for commercial purposes, but are compelled to carry out the obligations of the

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

Act, there will be an additional loss of 300,000 *l.*?—As I put it; but I can hardly pledge myself to that; but as 2 *s.* 6 *d.* is to 3 *d.* so is the loss on the whole.

1703. Roughly speaking, though you do not pledge yourself to the particular figure, it will be about 300,000 *l.*?—Yes.

1704. Was the main object of the scheme the widening of the street, or had you any object in getting rid of bad property?—The main object was in making a grand communication from the Great Northern Railway, which stands at the head of the Gray's Inn-road, to Holborn; it is one incessant communication of omnibus and vehicular traffic.

1705. Have you considered the possibility of carrying out the suggestion of the Committee of last year, viz.: selling the land in such a way as that the lower floor might be used for commercial purposes, and only the upper floor for artizans' dwellings?—I have thought of that in many ways; in unimportant streets it might be carried out, but in the great arterial communications of London I hardly think people would take property, let it out in shops, with valuble goods and so on, when the upper portion of the buildings might be devoted to artizan occupants, who might put objectionable things in their windows, and deal with the property in all manner of ways.

1706. Even though the communication to the upper part of the house was at the back?—Even if the communications were distinct.

1707. From what you have seen of the population, should you say that the working people are employed in the neighbourhood, or should you say they are migratory?—They are migratory, I fancy; but I would rather prepare a table showing that.

Chairman.

1708. With regard to this site of Tyndall's Buildings, that was one of the first schemes, I believe, which you presented under the Artizans' Act of 1875, was it not?—Yes.

1709. And in that scheme, which was presented under Dr. Gibbons's representation, you thought you would incur a loss of 69,000 *l.*?—Yes.

1710. That, I think, was rejected on account of its insufficiency, because you did not deal with it in a large enough way?—Yes, it was rejected on account of being a piecemeal scheme.

1711. But you do not mean to give as your evidence to the Committee, I presume, that, as a general principle, you may make improvements anywhere you like in London, and simply pay off the people, and let them go everywhere?—No, I do not.

1712. And you would probably agree with one of the surveyors, called by the Metropolitan Board the other day, in stating that although it may not be wise to build houses for the whole of this population, it may be very wise to build houses for a certain part of them?—Yes.

1713. Some may be allowed to go, and it is very wise to keep some where they are?—Yes.

1714. Have you no suggestion to make at all with

Chairman—continued.

with reference to the Gray's Inn-road improvement, except the commercial one?—The suggestion that I should make is this: I have obtained a return as to the location of their respective trades, to try and see how many could be accommodated of the 300 that is mentioned, in the site which the Board have acquired, or if any further could be accommodated in the immediate neighbourhood; then as to the remainder, to give them the same opportunity of selecting their places of residence as we afforded those we turned out of Sun-street, compensating them for their time and trouble.

1715. As a matter of a pure ratepayer's question, which you have to look after, the cheapest way of doing the whole thing would be to clear them all away, and compensate them?—Undoubtedly.

1716. But then other considerations come in?—Quite so.

1717. Have you thought of a suggestion of this kind, that you might be allowed to take a good part of the front of Gray's Inn-road for your commercial purposes, and get the best price you could, and where you get the greatest depth, that you might run up two or three of those large artizans' dwellings, at right angles to Gray's Inn-road?—I do not think it would be unfeasible.

1718. That is the sort of plan with which you started in the original Artizans' Scheme of 1875, is it not?—Yes.

1719. And, of course, in a scheme of that kind, where you had the greatest depth, if you are allowed to take the frontage to Gray's Inn-road for commercial purposes, it would be a great relief to you in cost?—Yes.

1720. And would be a great relief in housing a great number of the people who otherwise would be turned out?—Yes.

1721. In fact, some part of this great depth would be wasted, unless you employed it in some form or other of that kind?—It would be hardly wasted, because Gray's Inn-lane could be appropriated for many purposes requiring back premises; there are one or two establishments, printers, and so on, there, who require back workshops.

1722. But taking all the circumstances together, you do not think it an unreasonable suggestion that some part of Gray's Inn-road should be used in that way?—I think it is a suggestion that demands consideration.

1723. Probably you would consider what could be done, and how many people could be housed?—I will prepare a plan, and see how they could be accommodated.

Chairman—continued.

1724. I want to ask you one question about the Southwark and Great Dover-street scheme, because practically we might meet your views, probably, as to the Western improvement?—Yes.

1725. Have you no suggestion to make as to the Southwark Bridge and Great Dover-street scheme?—There I have an intimate acquaintance with the character of the population An honourable Member asked a question which would apply very strongly to it, it is the worst population we have dealt with. We have there chiefly registered lodging-houses of the lowest class, where they charge 3*d.* a night; they are people who loaf about public-houses, who seem to have nothing to do during the day, who depart of a night on their mission, whatever it may be, the population there could, with the greatest advantage, be disturbed in its entirety, and it would be the best thing to do with it.

1726. This very low class of people are not the people who would be likely to go out into the suburbs, are they?—There would be no difficulty in their getting accommodation.

1727. I do not say there would be difficulty, but they are not the people to go there of their own accord; they prefer to go loafing about somewhere, is not that so?—They are a very shifting population; they depend upon the nightly lodging-house, the registered lodging-house.

1728. Should not you expect to find that if they were turned out here they would further overcrowd other overcrowded parts of London; are they not that class of population that would do so?—Possibly that may be so.

1729. I do not suggest that they should be housed upon this particular plot, but that certain buildings should be built and a better class of people housed here, in order to remove the overcrowding that would otherwise take place?—All those sites coloured blue are appropriated for those purposes. I think the suggestion you made with reference to a part of the sites on the ground floor being appropriated for shops, would in that case be a most valuable one, because it would bring a market in that particular neighbourhood, lying between St. George's Church and the Great Dover-road, our fire-brigade station, and you get a better class of inhabitants where you have a market provided than where you have the registered houses and lodging-houses existing.

1730. With artizans' dwellings over the top?—Yes.

1731. Will you, when you give the other suggestion your consideration, consider this plan?—I will.

Dr. SEPTIMUS GIBBON, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1732. YOU are Medical Officer in charge of the district in which Gray's Inn-road is?—Yes.

1733. What is the name of the district?—It is under the Board of Works for the Holborn district.

1734. How long have you been medical officer to the district?—Since they were first appointed in February 1856.

Chairman—continued.

1735. I need hardly ask, do you know intimately this particular piece of ground about which we have been talking?—I do, intimately, and I should like to impress upon the Committee the great importance of that which Mr. Goddard has been urging, namely, the repeal of the 23rd section; it has completely ruined the neighbourhood of Gray's Inn-road, the shopkeepers are all ruined,

Chairman—continued.

ruined, and sanitarily, it is a ruin; because it is impossible to get the landlords, who are very needy, many of them, to do proper repairs; and many of the houses are closed, and the population has completely changed since this Act of Parliament was passed in the year 1875.

1736. You would like to see something done?—I should like to see it abrogated at once as regards Gray's Inn-road; a number of private individuals have erected four blocks of buildings in the immediate neighbourhood, accommodating 1,300 persons.

1737. With regard to those people, if you know the district, you know the habits of the people?—I do.

1738. Do you agree with what you have heard to-day, that it would be wise or proper simply to deal with all these kind of people by giving them a sum of money to go away, or would it be wise that certain buildings in the way of artizans' dwellings should be built in the neighbourhood?—It would have been wise in 1875 to have done it, but the population has changed; they are now simply costermongers, flower girls, and match sellers of the lowest class, who have gone into the places previously occupied by printers, bakers, and tailors, who were obliged to live near their work; now there are a certain number of Irish labourers and porters at the Metropolitan Meat Market, and porters at Covent Garden Market.

1739. It is those people that I want particularly to ask about; is it your opinion that you may cut them adrift and send them to find places for themselves, or do you think it is wise, as a matter of principle, that at all events the persons whose businesses are locally situated should have houses provided somewhere for them?—I think so, and in a central place as near their late residence as possible, and as near the centre of London as possible, because many of the people cannot live away in the country.

1740. Can you mention some of the trades that cannot go away?—Printers engaged in night work, porters at the Meat Market, who have to be there at three or four o'clock in the morning, porters at Covent Garden Market, bakers, and of course the costermongers must be in the central part of London in order to get to the markets early.

1741. You have none of the sackmakers in that part, have you?—I have no sackmakers, but there are people connected with Reid's Brewery, they must be near their work; they come home late at night with their drays, and have to be up very early in the morning. There are many classes who cannot afford to lose two hours a day in going backwards and forwards, and there are others who cannot afford the blood and muscle, because they have a certain amount of walking to and fro from the railway stations at one end to the railway stations at the other end.

1742. Is there much overcrowding in your district?—There was, but I think it has diminished lately; there was a considerable amount of overcrowding a few years ago.

1743. I believe your opinion is that the Act of 1875 has not been worked in such a way as to reap the benefit intended by it?—Certainly not; with us it has not been loyally carried out. The

Chairman—continued.

officers of the Metropolitan Board of Works first of all prepared a very good scheme for this very neighbourhood between Gray's Inn-lane and Leather-lane; then the Committee took it out of their hands and prepared a tolerable scheme, which I have here.

1744. Have you the original scheme that they prepared there?—I have not the first scheme; that was rejected by the Board of Works, and was not published. This was the scheme prepared by the Committee (*handing in the same*), and at the last moment they called in a land surveyor, who made a still worse scheme; he cut out all, except a portion, and proposed to put in blocks of buildings higgledy piggledy, at right angles in squares, destroying the street; some of them were to be six storeys high, and some not 14 feet apart.

1745. And that scheme was rejected?—Yes.

1746. And, in your opinion, rejected properly?—Most properly.

1747. You think that if the original scheme had been carried out, and the houses built, it would have been a great advantage to the neighbourhood?—Yes, very great. There are two other representations that I made as to St. Peter's-lane, St. Sepulchre's, which is occupied very much by the porters in the Meat Market, and another in Lucy's-buildings, Vine-street.

1748. They were not taken up by the Board at all?—They declined them not on the merits; they said they had so many schemes.

1749. Do they remain in the same state in which they were?—No; under Mr. Torrens' Act we condemned portions of those, and there is a scheme of a private individual, Mr. Robinson, a solicitor, who has erected 30 dwellings there.

1750. The two small schemes that you talk of are two places that you represented to the Board, as medical officer, as unhealthy areas?—I did.

1751. And the Board did not take them up?—The Board did not take them up.

1752. You have seen a good deal of the working of Mr. Torrens' Act?—Yes.

1753. In your opinion, has that Act worked very well in your district?—It has done a great deal of good.

1754. Just tell me what it has done?—We applied it to 356 houses, with the result of having 251 thoroughly repaired and improved, and 64 demolished, 34 rebuilt, and 18 closed. Now four out of 18 are the sites of artizans' dwellings, built by Mr. Taylor, a private individual, on Lord Leigh's ground; they contained 98 rooms, and they have just been opened.

1755. I presume the Acts of Mr. Torrens will do a great deal of good if put in force in a great many places?—Yes, they will; they might be improved; they are too complicated, and cause so much trouble, and there is no remuneration to the officers who carry them out; that is the impediment. The surveyor especially, who has to prepare the plans, and go into a great deal of the hard work, gets nothing for it.

1756. I may take it, may I not, that the Acts themselves are very beneficial?—Very much so.

1757. One question about sending these poor people away; you would have no objection to

Chairman—continued.

to a good number of this kind of population being sent into the suburbs, provided it did not interfere with their daily occupation, would you?—Sending them to Walthamstow was mentioned, where they deluge the village, and cause houses to spring up like mushrooms; they build them in three weeks; they lay them without any foundations, and they are all congregated together, all of one class, which I think is objectionable; I think if they were split amongst other classes, if there was a mixture of classes it would tend to their morality and education, and their general well-being.

1758. Have you had an opportunity of seeing the sort of buildings that they are putting up in those places?—Yes, I have property at Walthamstow, unfortunately.

1759. What is the condition of these houses?—They are four-roomed houses; houses that are said to have cost 200 *l.* to erect, but more likely they cost 150 *l.*

1760. What do they let for?—About 8 *s.* a week.

1761. Four rooms?—Yes.

1762. How many families live in a house?—In the houses that I know there are two families, a family on each floor.

1763. Are the sanitary arrangements good there?—They have recently laid down a sewer, but unfortunately they have a sewage farm, which is a mistake.

1764. It is outside the district of the Metropolitan Board of Works?—Yes, it is outside the district of the Metropolitan Board of Works; it is on low ground. The buildings are very bad, and built without any foundations, or any separation of the rooms; the party walls are not carried through the roof.

1765. It is your opinion that it would never do to carry on these improvements, and simply compensate the people for going out, leaving them to find their own lodgings in the places where they could?—No, I think artizans' dwellings should be built in all parts of the metropolis.

1766. At all events in some proportion to the inhabitants dispossessed?—Yes.

1767. Have you formed any opinion as to what proportion ought to be provided, looking at the nature of the employment of the people?—I think a great many have come into these new buildings who formerly lived away; they came in from Peckham.

1768. They have come back again?—Yes.

1769. Have you had any experience of that?—Only recently, because they have only recently been opened; the new dwellings in Liquorpond-street and Clerkenwell-road.

1770. Are you able to give us any reliable opinion with regard to your own district, as to what sort of proportions the new houses ought to bear upon the displacement?—No, I cannot do so.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

1771. I thought I caught you making an observation that the Metropolitan Board of Works had not carried out the Artizans' Act in a loyal spirit?—I think not in our district.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

1772. Will you give me your idea of carrying out the Acts of the Board in a loyal spirit; if the Board at once undertake to carry out the Act of Parliament immediately it is passed; do you think that is loyal; I ask the question; do me the favour of answering it?—Two of my plans they did not carry out.

1773. You make a charge against the Board, and I ask whether if the Board having an Act of Parliament to carry out, proceed to carry it out, that is acting in a loyal, or not loyal spirit?—There are two manners of carrying out the spirit.

1774. I must have an answer to the question; if the Board carries out the Act of Parliament at once, is it acting loyally or not?—It is the spirit in which it is carried out.

1775. I want you to give me an answer to that; if we carry it out is it loyal or disloyal; you decline to answer?—No, I do not decline to answer, but there are two methods of doing the thing.

1776. If Parliament passes an Act of Parliament imposing certain duties on a certain body, if that body proceeds at once to carry it out, is it acting loyally or disloyally; I must press for an answer, yes or no?—Well, it is acting as you say, without any adjective connected with it.

1777. Is it loyal?—My epithet depended upon the manner in which it is carried out.

1778. Do you wish to withdraw your epithet?—No.

1779. Is it acting loyally or disloyally?—If it is not acting loyally, it is disloyally.

1780. Then you say that the Board carrying out the Act of Parliament at once acts disloyally?—No, I do not.

1781. You must either say, yes or no, or give me an answer?—I have given you my answer.

1782. What is your answer?—They have carried it out, but disloyally.

1783. Now, I shall ask you an abstract question; if Parliament passes a certain Act of Parliament imposing a duty on a certain body, and if that body at once proceeds to obey the orders of Parliament, is it, in your idea, acting loyally or disloyally?—Disloyally, if they do it in a manner which renders it nugatory.

1784. In a manner that you do not approve of; do you say, yes or no?—I say, no. They did not act loyally.

1785. Then you say that a Board which carries out an Act of Parliament at once does not act loyally?—They did not carry it out in the spirit of the Act, if they produce no action, and carry it out in such a manner that the Secretary of State cannot confirm it.

1786. I have not got to the Secretary of State. If the Board carry out the Act of Parliament, is it loyal or disloyal?—I have given you my answer; I cannot say more.

1787. Take your own Board; supposing your Board carry out an Act of Parliament at once, or tries to carry it out, is it a loyal or disloyal act?—The commencement is a loyal act.

1788. Did not the Board at once, upon the receipt of your representation, proceed to discuss the matter at once?—They did.

1789. Did they not come down to the place in

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

Gray's Inn-lane, and go over every spot of it, and was I not there?—I believe you did.

1790. And we went over the whole of it?—Yes.

1791. Did not we go through every house and alley, and look at them?—Yes.

1792. And did not we compare the scheme of Mr. Isaacs with others?—Yes.

1793. And we discussed it thoroughly?—You did.

1794. And then we had another scheme drawn up?—Yes.

1795. Did not we discuss that thoroughly?—You set it aside.

1796. Then we have another one here; do you know any reasons which animated the Board, or are you not aware, as medical officer, that the Metropolitan Board of Works having this Act to carry out, to use your own phrase, loyally did take care to be loyal to all parties, and would not approve the scheme which I hold in my hands of Mr. Isaacs, because they considered that it was combining a street improvement in the neighbourhood with an artizans' scheme; are you not aware that that is the fact of the case?—I do not know what you did; you set aside your own officers' report.

1797. Are you not aware that if this scheme had been carried out, it would have been under cover of an Artizans' Act, making a street improvement?—Your own officer did not produce that report; Mr. Isaacs' report came from the outside; you delegated the matter to your own officers, and they did not combine a street improvement with an artizans' improvement.

1798. Are you complaining that this was not carried out?—No, I am not; I merely say that you had three plans, and one from the outside.

1799. We had three plans; you discard Mr. Isaacs' plan altogether; was that the one you

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

approve of?—I do not know how you dealt with it; I approve of Mr. Isaacs' plan.

1800. Then, if you approve of it, you know something about it?—Yes.

1801. Does that, or does it not, combine an artizans' scheme with a street improvement scheme?—It did.

1802. Then the Metropolitan Board of Works having, in the spirit of the Act, to carry out an artizans' scheme, do you not think they were perfectly right in rejecting a scheme which combined a Metropolitan Board of Works street improvement, which ought to have been brought in under a different Act of Parliament?—Certainly.

1803. You think they were right?—Yes.

1804. Then you disapprove of this plan, which you quite approve of the Home Secretary not carrying out?—Yes, but there was another one of your officers, Sir Joseph Bazalgette, and Mr. Vulliamy's.

1805. Is this the one that you like?—That was the one that I thought sufficient.

1806. What is the difference between this and the one I have just mentioned; why do you disapprove of it?—I do not disapprove of it, nor of your Committee's plan; either of those two would have done; I disapprove of the one which you finally adopted.

1807. You have now allowed the Board to be loyal; did not they take out every one of the plague spots and deal with them; every one of these were plague spots, and every one was dealt with?—They were.

1808. I understood you to make an observation about a road 14 feet wide; where is that road?—It is in the third scheme which you adopted. At the last moment you adopted Mr. Vigers' plan, coloured purple.

Thursday, 23rd March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Arthur Balfour.
Mr. Brodrick.
Sir Richard Cross.
Mr. Hastings.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.

The Right Honourable Sir RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, in the Chair.

Dr. Septimus Gibbon, re-called; and further Examined.

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.

1809. When we left off last Monday, I think we could not quite make out about the different schemes, and I understood you to say that you disapproved of this scheme that I have got, which was brought before the Home Secretary?—The Metropolitan Board of Works promoted three schemes; first, their own officer's scheme, then the committee's scheme, and that was referred to Mr. Vigers, and he brought up another scheme, which I have here.

1810. You disapprove of the scheme which the Metropolitan Board of Works brought before the Home Secretary?—I do.

1811. And you think it a pity that the Metropolitan Board of Works adopted Mr. Vigers' suggestions?—I do, a great pity.

1812. I suppose you will allow that a certain amount of care was taken, and that we told our officers to look into it; that we consulted Mr. Vigers and other responsible parties, but unfortunately we took a course that you did not approve, which was endorsed by the Home Secretary?—Yes, Mr. Vigers was not the right man to consult; he is a land surveyor, and knows nothing about building.

1813. You think that we had better have stuck to our own officers?—Yes.

1814. To go to another case. You know something about the Gray's Inn-lane improvements?—I do.

1815. Does not the Street Improvement of 1877 take in a portion of the area which you think is insanitary, and which ought to have been removed?—It does, the major portion. I think the Metropolitan Board of Works substituted that for the improvement scheme.

1816. Then, *pro tanto*, you approve of it?—I do, strongly.

1817. Will you tell the Committee the feeling of the district with regard to the working of the 33rd section. Can you tell me first of all whether you find that it has impeded our progress?—It has greatly stopped progress, for the last five years completely.

1818. Do you think that the stoppage, by reason of the 33rd section, has been a very great discomfort to all the inhabitants, and, I might say, ruin to a great many?—Ruin to a great number, and discomfort to all.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

1819. In consequence of the vast increase of the rates?—Yes.

1820. You concur with me that the whole of the district there is adverse to the 33rd section, and would be glad to see not only a modification, but a total repeal of it, if possible?—Yes; under the 33rd section it is impossible, or impracticable, to replace the same inhabitants; they are costermongers; we have a vast number of costermongers. I should think 1,000 barrows, in my own district, who follow their trade, and of course they cannot live very well in model lodging-houses; they cannot dress their vegetables, and they cannot stow their barrows away, and they must go to a dilapidated neighbourhood, where they get old houses and large yards; and where they can carry their things, and manipulate their vegetables, because the oranges and vegetables have to be dressed before they come out in the morning; they have to be watered and washed, and they want ample space for that; they cannot do that in a model lodging-house, up five or six pairs of stairs.

1821. I may shortly say that you, on behalf of the district of which you have been for many years medical officer, say that you quite concur in the desire of the Metropolitan Board of Works, either for a total abolition, or a very serious modification of the 33rd section?—I do, strongly.

Mr. *William Holms.*

1822. I should like to ask you, as a practical man, what you would propose with reference to the 33rd section?—I think I should leave it to a jury; by that section you throw it upon the Metropolitan Board of Works; I am against public bodies engaging in building operations; I would rather leave it to private persons, and I think you should give them a bonus to do it, exempt them from taxes, just as you encourage charities by exempting them from taxes. Mr.

Mr. *William Holms*—continued.

Gladstone stated in his speech that it was done to the extent of 8 or 12 per cent.; if you did that, you would have plenty of erections spring up; if it was worth the builder's while to do it, they would be built in great abundance.

1823. You do not think it would be wise to leave it to the question of supply and demand, and to leave it to private enterprise?—No; I think the law of supply and demand has failed; you must give a premium or bonus by way of exemption, or give a premium for building these houses; they do not pay.

1824. Would you think it an advisable thing to have such a rule as this, that before taking down a certain number of houses, I do not mean so small a number as 15, but some much more considerable number than 15 houses, a representation should be made to the Home Secretary that there is sufficient accommodation within a certain radius; would that be sufficient, provided that such accommodation could be pointed out to the Home Secretary?—There would be great difficulty; it would depend upon what radius you take in a half-mile radius; it would be impracticable to give it unless they were reconstructed.

1825. Say, within a radius of a mile; would it be a satisfactory thing if before these buildings were taken down, you should be able to show the Home Secretary that you had sufficient accommodation within the radius of a mile?—Yes, if you had it, but the difficulty is in getting any one to erect these buildings; you must go behind that.

1826. You would ascertain whether or not there were houses unoccupied that might be pulled down and rebuilt within that radius?—For example, I mentioned to the Committee the other day, that in the new buildings there were 346 separate rooms, enough to accommodate 1,300 people, in this immediate neighbourhood, but they are all full; those are recent erections; we have several others, Saffron-hill and Farringdon-road, and others which I exclude, but within the last 12 months these have been erected and opened, and they are all full.

1827. In your experience, what is about the longest distance that working people, labourers who begin at 6 o'clock in the morning, will go to lodgings?—Many go to Enfield. A superior class of artizans go to Enfield and Walthamstow and Edmonton.

1828. I do not talk of by railway, but how far do they walk?—I have heard of them walking five miles; but it is a serious tax, from Stoke Newington up to my own house in Oxford-terrace.

1829. We will say within a circumscribed radius of a mile and-a-half or two miles?—It is a tax upon the people to make them walk so far.

1830. It is; but from what I have seen in Glasgow, the poor people do walk one, two, or three miles to get accommodation; and the system there has been carried out, the authorities being pledged to certify that sufficient accommodation has been given within a certain radius?—I believe that is so.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1831. Did I understand you to say that private enterprise had failed in supplying dwellings?—Artizans' dwellings of this class.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

1832. You said the last time that we met, that a number of private individuals had erected four blocks of buildings in the immediate neighbourhood, accommodating 1,300 persons?—Yes, because they got the land for next to nothing.

1833. How did they get the land?—By an Act of Parliament, because the Metropolitan Board of Works had let it at a very cheap rate, and Lord Leigh and Mr. Hubbard pay, I believe, next to nothing for it.

1834. Is not that a case of private enterprise succeeding; it is not a case of the Metropolitan Board of Works building?—It is an experiment; you cannot say it has succeeded until we see the returns.

1835. It has succeeded in this case so far, that a supply has been actually given?—It has, to that extent.

1836. I want to know exactly what you meant in reply to a question put to you by the Right honourable Chairman upon the last occasion, with respect to the neighbourhood being ruined; what is it that has ruined the neighbourhood?—The dwellings are sanitarily ruined, and the neighbourhood is morally ruined, by getting into the buildings a very low class, match-sellers and flower girls, prostitutes, in other words; and the costermongers have a little increased too; but take the small shopkeepers, and the respectable ratepayers, they are generally ruined; they have gone into the Bankruptcy Courts, and have been pecuniarily ruined.

1837. What has ruined them?—The dilapidated state of the houses; the Metropolitan Board of Works have unlimited powers to pull down an immense number at each end, from Portpool-lane to Liquorpond-street, and from Fox-court to Holborn they could pull down. There were certain spots covered in those streets which were allocated to artizans' dwellings.

1838. That was done under the Streets Improvement Act of 1877?—Yes, under the Streets Improvement Acts.

1839. You mean in spite of these spots having been allocated to workmens' dwellings, the neighbourhood has been ruined by the demolition that has been going on?—Yes; and we have have had to close many of the courts for sanitary reasons. We have closed the whole of Bell-court; and Pinner's-court we shall close next week, on account of the bad sanitary state; we cannot get the owners to spend money upon them; they have been in that state for five years.

1840. Is there any mode by which that can be prevented; if you demolish a large area you must displace a considerable population; even suppose you build up again there must be a considerable interval between the demolition and the replacement, and then they are replaced by a different class?—Yes.

1841. Do you see any remedy by which that kind of change can be avoided?—No; the persons have to look out for another dwelling. There are an immense number of new dwellings springing up in the suburbs of London.

1842. But if the houses are in the condition you speak of, sanitarily, in spite of the difficulties in the period of transition, it must be a great advantage to the neighbourhood to get rid of insanitary dwellings?—It is, but we close them, and

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

and there they remain. The people are depending upon them. The shopkeepers in front of Gray's Inn-lane have been driven into the Bankruptcy Court.

1843. But you do not see any mode by which that could be prevented?—If they were pulled down, instead of being left such a time; if you did it in four or five months, of course the agony would be much less, and the loss would be much less.

Mr. Rankin.

1844. Can you tell me at all whether you think that the number of places which will have to be pulled down or altered under these Acts of Parliament are very numerous in London still?—There are a great many portions of older London, and a very great many slums in my own district; in my own district I have many of them. I have reported three to the Metropolitan Board of Works.

1845. Is it a work which will take some years to accomplish yet?—I think it was done without any restrictions; if you allowed more freedom to the local authority it might be done much more speedily.

1846. I suppose you have never made any calculations as to the cost of making your district a part of a sanitary district?—No, I have not.

1847. Are there many empty houses in your district which would be suitable for artizans' dwellings?—None; except those that have been compulsorily closed.

1848. You said that you thought private enterprise would not meet this want. There are many private companies started to supply labourers and artizans with dwellings, and some of them pay?—Some of them do; but as they do not give the commercial value for the land, it is a charity to that extent.

1849. Surely there are some companies that are purely commercial. There is a company called the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwelling Company?—As to the Dwellings' Improvement Company, they take old houses and make a profit, and they do well; they get the highest rent they can. Mr. Thomas Flight and Mr. Earley Cook made very large incomes; 300 *l.* a week Mr. Flight used to receive, and Mr. Earley Cook has 400 *l.* or 500 *l.* coming in weekly. They escape the repairs; they take leasehold houses, and they pay munificently.

1850. Your belief is that the regeneration of this class of building cannot be left to private enterprise?—I think not.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1851. You reported to your Board, about a year ago, that the total population of the district under your care had been reduced from 10,000 to 7,000 odd?—It had been reduced to about that in 10 years.

1852. And all that time you were endeavouring to put in force the Acts which are still existing for compulsory repair, and in default of compulsory repair, demolition?—Yes.

1853. What is your experience of the working of the Act of 1868, as amended in 1879; in what respect was it most effective, as compelling repairs which would otherwise be left undone,

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

or as driving the local authority to pull down and rebuild?—The local authority, in my parish, in order to get a rate, has to go before the general public twice a year, and it would be quite impracticable to get a rate with which to go into building speculation upon artizans' dwellings. Therefore we have not put in force the Amending Act of 1879; it has been a dead letter with us.

1854. What was the operative motive with the local board; why was it a dead letter?—Because they would have to get a separate rate in order to do it, and they would have to go to the general public to levy a rate not exceeding 2 *d.* in the pound; besides that, the board have a very strong prejudice against anything of a Communistic nature. If you supply houses, why should not you supply coats, and legs of mutton, and shirts; that is the general feeling of the public.

1855. The Statute only gave the right to build when it had been proved, by experience, that the land could not be let to any one who would build?—Yes.

1856. Have you found under the Act of 1868, amended by the Supplementary Act of 1879, that you could carry out that first alternative in your district that we have been talking of; the district of Gray's Inn-lane?—Many private owners have re-constructed the houses; we have demolished them, and they have re-constructed them. They have re-constructed artizans' dwellings in three or four instances, and in other instances they have devoted them to commercial purposes; warehouses and manufactories. We have vacant sites now, but with my board you might as well attempt to make them fly as to go into a building speculation.

1857. Was not the fact that the alternative of the work being done out of the common fund of the metropolis an operative motive also; that if they did not do it it might be left to the Metropolitan Board of Works to do?—I do not think they would approve of doing it themselves, and still less the Metropolitan Board of Works doing it.

1858. With regard to these buildings, equal to 350 dwellings, which have been erected by private enterprise within the last 12 or 18 months, they have been erected, I understood you to say, because there was no prospect of the Metropolitan Board of Works being able to rehabilitate the district within a reasonable time?—That only applies to two; Evelyn Buildings, built upon Mr. Hubbard's land and Lord Leigh's land; they have been erected by a private individual; they attempted to get up a company, and it failed, and the private individual saw his way (he is a solicitor in Gray's Inn) to do it himself; but the other two buildings, the Town Hall buildings and the Victoria buildings, are built upon land taken from the Metropolitan Board of Works in the new Clerkenwell-road; they are built by builders, and I presume the inducement was getting the land for next to nothing, and they see their way to make a profit.

1859. And the Board gave the land for next to nothing as an inducement to have buildings put up?—Yes, I think so.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

1860. And to that extent you think the Board are willing to contribute out of the rates?—By way of exemption the Board may do it, and has done it, in fact.

1861. I think in a contiguous district, where the City took great powers from Parliament in 1864 to pull down and improve, a great number of persons were dispossessed to make the Holborn Viaduct?—A great number were; about 2,000 in my district and the adjoining district, on the City side of St. Andrew, Holborn.

1862. And that is independent of the clearance necessary for Farringdon-road?—Yes, that occurred some 30 years before that. There they promised to spend 40,000*l.*, which they did not do for 30 years. Thirty years afterwards they did expend on building Farringdon-road and the Corporation buildings about that sum, I should think. Then came the Viaduct, where they were compelled within five years to erect buildings, according to a clause in the Act, for the artizans displaced in the construction of the Viaduct. They did build, and find accommodation for about 200 individuals, for about 40 families; and very nice dwellings they are, but they are not occupied by the artizans even; they are occupied by clerks, who keep pianos in their rooms, and who have a very snug place built for them.

1863. There are two separate questions, however, to which I wish to direct your attention. One is the power given by Parliament in developing the policy of displacement and replacement, and the other is the accuracy or otherwise of the Corporation's fulfilment of their duty under those powers. But coming to the first question, which we are more concerned about here; do you recognise in the Act of the 27th & 28th of the Queen, a direction given by Parliament as a condition precedent to the vast powers conceded for the demolition and construction of the Holborn Viaduct, a direction that the Corporation should provide for the mechanics, labourers, and other persons of the poorer sort who are displaced for the purpose of the City improvements?—Certainly.

1864. And in the Statute you understand the words to mean that out of the funds of the Corporation they shall from time to time, within a reasonable period, not only erect, but fit out, these dwellings with such conveniences as may be proper for the accommodation of mechanics, labourers, and other persons of the poorer sort so displaced?—Yes, "the working and poorer classes" are the terms of the Act.

1865. Do you recollect the state of feeling in the district when the Act was sought and obtained in the year 1864?—I think my Board opposed some of the details, but they approved of the principle of the Act, and the construction of the Viaduct.

1866. Was there any serious opposition to the making of that great work?—Not by my Board.

1867. Or by any population?—Not as to details. I think some of the people petitioned against it.

1868. When the greater portion of the demolition had been completed, and the works begun, the Corporation found it necessary to seek an amending Act in the year 1867?—Yes, to extend the time chiefly.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

1869. Have you looked at the terms of that Act?—Some time ago; not recently.

1870. But generally you know what its purport was?—I know what its purport was, that there was an obligation upon them to erect those buildings, and I know because my Board had to apply to them three or four times in order to induce them to do so.

1871. Was that one of the conditions upon which the Viaduct was made?—Yes; and my Board of Health did take the case into a court of justice, to compel the Corporation to erect the buildings.

1872. And you recollect that in the amended Act of 1867 the same clause was reiterated, word for word, and made mandatory upon the Corporation to provide for the persons so displaced of the poorer sort?—It was.

1873. A further Act was acquired still later; have you any recollection what that Act did, or was intended to do in the year 1872?—I do not know that that Bill was passed; there was a scheme to construct artizans' dwellings about that neighbourhood, which took a large portion of Bleeding Heart-yard, and Charles-street, and Great Saffron Hill.

1874. What I speak of is the Act which was necessary for the completion of the Holborn Viaduct works, which was passed as an extending Act by Parliament in the year 1872; are you aware that the same mandatory clause was reiterated in that Act?—I believe so; I do not know particularly. I have no doubt it was so, because in the year 1874 these buildings were erected under that Act.

1875. Supposing that no such clause had been passed, or proposal had been made by Parliament, do you suppose that the public opinion of the district would have been satisfied to allow such an Act to pass without opposition; if 2,000 people were to be displaced and sent hither and thither without any provision of an adequate kind, do you suppose that there would have been any opposition, from that great district?—I think there would probably have been from the sanitary authority of the Board of Works

1876. You told the Committee that of the 2,000 only one-tenth had been even nominally provided for by the Corporation?—Yes, 400 tenements.

1877. Is there any prospect that private enterprise will now come in and supply the other nine-tenths of the accommodation?—I think not, unless they get a bonus for doing it, or unless you can make these dwellings so that they will be remunerative, then they will snap them up fast enough.

1878. Have any great employers in the district adopted the system which has prevailed in other parts of the metropolis of making provision by private means for the workpeople dependent upon them, such as Combe, Delafield & Co.?—In Reid's brewery they have some houses, but they were old houses; they have not erected fresh ones, and they have constructed a library.

1879. They have done something?—Yes, I do not know that they did erect any dwellings, except for their superior officers.

1880. From your medical knowledge, what is the

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

the opinion of the largest employers as to the expediency of keeping their workpeople and those dependent upon them within easy reach of their work?—All the most business men think it is most desirable to provide them not only with tenements but medical attendance; Mr. John Earley Cook provides medical attendance for his tenants.

1881. When the Gray's Inn-road became gradually in a state of ruin from circumstances which we need not repeat, where did the people go to; where did the overflow go?—Some went to Peckham.

1882. That is five miles off?—Yes, and they were scattered in all directions; some went to Leyton.

1883. What proportion of the people live by employments that afforded the possibility of their going there?—There were a large number of printers there. I do not know where they have gone; they must be within walking distance of their printing offices, because they have to walk home after 5 o'clock in the morning.

1884. Has it been brought to your notice that Clerkenwell-street, which was moderately crowded before, since these demolitions of Gray's Inn-road and Clerkenwell-road, has become more crowded?—Yes, that is the case in my district, and the other place, in Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, has been greatly overcrowded.

1885. That is a middle-class place?—Yes, East-street, Old North-street, and New North-street, and others.

1886. What is the position of Lamb's Conduit-street; it used to be a middle-class street?—It has been overrun by tenemental lodgers and converted into barracks; many houses are let out to weekly tenants room by room.

1887. Without any increased provisions for sanitary arrangements?—Without any.

Mr. *Hastings.*

1888. Are the persons who have been sent away, owing to the demolition of these buildings, and who are displaced as you have described, in the neighbourhood, worse off or better off as to accommodation than they were before?—I should say rather better off.

1889. Sanitarily?—I am not able to speak, with much confidence, with regard to that, because I only know one or two of the suburban towns, Walthamstow, Leyton, and Acton.

1890. I was referring to those that you spoke of as being in streets in Clerkenwell?—There they are much worse off, and are crowding into the immediate neighbourhood.

Chairman.

1891. I understand you to say that the state of things in Gray's Inn-road is such, at the present moment, that you would like something done at all events to get rid of it?—Yes, immediately.

1892. That is your reason for saying you would get rid of the limitation as to pulling down 15 houses?—Yes, I would suspend it at the present time.

Chairman—continued.

1893. Is it, or not, your opinion that it would be wise to allow the Metropolitan Board of Works to convert all this land to commercial purposes, or do you still think that artizans' dwellings should be built upon some part of it?—I think artizans' dwellings ought to be built.

1894. You have no wish to relieve the Board of the obligation to devote part of the land to artizans?—None whatever; part of the land in Clerkenwell is allocated, and buildings now have been erected after some years.

1895. And your great object, as you said, is that whatever is done should be done as quickly as possible?—It is.

1896. Do you think that a cheaper set of buildings could be built than the Peabody Buildings, by which cheaper accommodation could be got?—Cheapness is badness, as a rule.

1897. Do you think that the Peabody Buildings are too lasting or too expensive?—I do not like any of the Peabody Buildings that I have been into; they are so dark and dismal, more like prisons than residences, they go on the barrack system, congregating together.

1898. Which of the model lodging-house companies have the best buildings?—I think Alderman Waterlow's. The Artizans' Dwellings Improvement Company's are the best lodgings, they have better sanitary arrangements, and they have closets and washhouses all in one establishment, whereas a man in my own district, for instance, who is building one, goes upon the system of having a dwelling-house complete in itself; the other builders divide them and have a closet between two or three sets of rooms; and that is objectionable. Any public conveniences of that sort, held in common, are always getting out of order; they are not kept well.

1899. One of the great objects which you wish to see avoided in the demolition, is the overcrowding, which is a necessary consequence to a certain extent?—It is.

Mr. *Torrens.*

1900 You know the Palmerston Buildings, in Goswell-road; what do you think of those?—They are excellent; they are just outside my district, there you have shops below, and the entrances for the tenemental dwellings are at the back, so that they make magnificent shops, which they let for 65 *l.* to 75 *l.* a year for the shops and basement. They have been constructed by Alderman Waterlow on the Northampton Estate, and all about there.

Chairman.

1901. That you approve of?—I approve of it, and I think something of that sort ought to be adopted in Gray's Inn-road.

Mr *Torrens.*

1902. Do you know on what terms they got the site from Lord Northampton?—I do not know, but they must have got it very cheap. In order to make these things pay, they must do so.

Dr. John William Tripe; called in, and Examined.

Chairman.

1903. You, I believe, are the President of the Society of Medical Officers of Health?—Yes.

1904. And you have been medical officer of health for Hackney, for the last 26 years?—I have.

1905. Are you well acquainted with the dwellings inhabited by the labouring classes in that district?—I am, personally.

1906. Have a very large number been built there during the last 10 or 12 years?—A very large number indeed.

1907. Can you give us any notion of the quantity?—The total number of buildings erected in Hackney has been, I think, very nearly 9,000 in the 10 years; the increase in the Hackney district of inhabited houses was 8,156, and a considerable proportion of these were houses built for artizans' dwellings, in fact houses under 25 *l.* a year rental.

1908. The Homerton and Victoria Park Railway Stations are near to those localities, I believe?—To some of them; to those occupied almost entirely by artizans and labourers.

1909. What kind of people inhabit the houses?—There are some better class houses in the vicinity, especially of Victoria Park, but the houses upon the Hackney Wick estate at the back are an inferior class of houses, four or five-roomed, and six roomed some of them, and a few eight-roomed houses; they average one and a-half families per house, and about six and a-half people per house. A large number of them have come from places that that have been pulled down for improvements, viz., from Whitechapel and Golden-lane, as well as from the vicinity of the Holborn Viaduct. Generally they are costermongers and artizans and labourers, in fair proportion.

1910. What sort of rents do they pay?—I do not know what the houses are rented at, because there is a deduction from the rent, but I think one-third of the houses in our district are rated at 20 *l.* a-year.

1911. How much do they get a room for?—Two shillings and 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per room; there are very few persons occupying single rooms. As an indication of that, amongst 6,200 poor class of houses examined in 1880, there were 25,000 inhabited rooms, and there were nearly 10,000 families and 36,000 inmates. You will find that that would be somewhere about six to a house, and one and a-half families to each house, so that the houses are small. The streets are moderately fairly wide, and the circulation of air goes on fairly well through them.

1912. Were there many houses built there before the Metropolis Buildings Amendment Act, 1879?—Yes, the majority of them at Hackney Wick. The Act was passed in 1878, but it came into operation on the 1st of January 1879.

1913. Can you tell us what kind of houses they are, and how they were built?—Very mixed. Some of them are almost as bad as they could be; the mortar was bad. I have seen mortar used, made chiefly of sifted dust containing vegetable matter, a little sand, and about 10 to 15 per cent. of lime. I have taken a sample of the mortar, and kept it in my room, and smelt it about once a week, and the smell continued for months when it was kept in a card-board box, and the mortar, after a time, became so friable that you could take it between your fingers and crumble it to pieces.

Chairman—continued.

1914. What kind of bricks were used?—Mostly porous bats; some of them in your hand felt as if you could blow through them; they used also new light yellow friable bricks.

1915. What sort of wood was used in the houses?—The wood was indifferent; the sashes became loose after a time.

1916. Now as to the foundations of the houses, were they cellared?—No; in this class of property there are no cellared dwellings, many of them are built upon the sod; 10 acres of them were almost entirely built upon a great dust heap.

1917. With regard to the foundations, was there any concrete put underneath?—Concrete was put under the walls, but did not cover the surface of the ground, which is far more important. The latter was not compulsory before the 1st of January 1879.

1918. Now about the death-rate in the houses, what was it?—It was in 1877, 32·9 against 19·4 for all the district, that was on a population of 2,000 on 10 acres. I took a district of 10 acres, and got out the whole of the deaths returned, but that number did not include the deaths in extraneous hospitals.

1919. What kind of sanitary arrangements were there in the houses?—They were bad, but we put them into good order. Last year I had all the bell-traps taken up, the sinks cut off from the drains, and the water-pipes also. I had everything we could disconnected from the drains, and if they could not be disconnected, we have had them trapped.

1920. And the health has improved in consequence?—Yes; we also paved the yards, and put gullies into the yards in place of the bells, which the children pull about.

1921. What class of people do the houses belong to?—Some persons have from 100 or 150 houses under their management, and others five or six; it is a very small owner who has only five or six houses.

1922. Can you speak to the Clapton Park estate?—Yes, a good part of it has been built lately. On the upper part of the Clapton Park estate, that which is built upon the high ground, there is a good class of houses and a good class of people; clerks and persons of that description live there; but upon the lower part of the estate, a good deal of which is some six or eight feet below the level of the Lea cut, which is an artificial cut, there are the same class of people as at Hackney Wick.

1923. What is the class of houses there?—The same class of houses as at Hackney Wick, a little bit better built, because they were built since 1879; they were necessarily better built, but many of them are below flood level; 400 were flooded last year.

1924. What

Chairman—continued.

1924. What kind of plaster did they use there?—The plaster is much worse than the mortar; the Metropolitan Board of Works have no power over plaster, unfortunately.

1925. Does the plaster show mould?—Yes, and it is often covered after a time with saline efflorescence, and the first paper that is put on gets damp.

1926. What is the health of the houses there?—We have not taken the census as to those, but the people do not look well, and they ought to look well, because they are in the open country.

1927. What sort of houses do you speak of in the lower part of the Clapton Park estate?—When the estate is covered there will be 2,000 houses, but there not so many at present.

1928. Were they built by speculative builders?—Yes; they were built by speculative builders, to a great extent.

1929. Did they build the houses to last only a short time?—I should be very sorry to give much for the reversion.

1930. Can you speak to the houses at Tottenham?—Yes, they are worse some of them. There are two estates, one especially, near to our district. About 400 houses were built there some years ago.

1931. How long ago?—Time goes so fast, that I hardly like to say, but I should think 10 years.

1932. Are they within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Building Act?—No; outside.

1933. What kind of houses are these built outside the Metropolitan Building Act?—I should think that the mortar, from what I saw of it, when they were building, did not contain 10 per cent. of lime. It was excessively bad. I had no right to take a sample, it being outside my district; but I saw that the bricks were as bad as they very well could be; in fact, I saw some bricks which had evidently been taken out of an ordinary cesspool; they were used for the foundations, and they stank.

1934. Do they take out the foundation, or are they built upon the sod?—They are built upon the sod, some of them that I saw. Being out of my district, I do not go there habitually. I may say that I watch the buildings more in my district than, as medical officer of health, I am called upon to do, and I have done so for many years. But here I can only say that the buildings were of wretched materials, and they are falling to pieces, and the bay windows of some of them are falling out.

1935. In your opinion, those houses are practically not fit for human habitation?—I think so, but there are houses of a better class being built close to them by another builder. There is another lot of houses built down in a hole almost, but I cannot say of what materials they were built.

1936. You say that some of these houses, about 400 in number, were flooded last December by the overflow of the Lea?—Yes. I saw the water outside up to the windows in the semi-basements in some of them; and we had the floor taken up in nearly the whole of them, and that was a considerable expense to the landlords.

1937. In 1881, last year, were they flooded?—It was in December 1881, that this took

Chairman—continued.

place. We have had five or six floods there since I have been medical officer of health. The first flood in 1881 occurred in March; 79 houses were flooded then; in December 1881, 395 houses were flooded. I call it 400 in round numbers.

1938. Have the local authorities no power to interfere?—None. The Hackney Board of Works have applied to the Metropolitan Board of Works, who say they have no power. They have applied to the water company, who chiefly caused it by cutting off the proper channels, or interfering with the channels. They have also applied to the River Lea Conservancy Board, and they all say that they have nothing to do with it, but I do not think the Hackney Board will rest satisfied.

1939. That is as regards flooding, but what do you say as regards the building of houses?—I do not complain so much of the building; the mortar is not so good as might be, but it is not such as I could well interfere with; and the same with the bricks, they are all fair.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

1940. Is there no power in the Metropolitan Board of Works, or in any other authority, to prevent houses being built in a district liable to floods?—None in the metropolis; I think that that, and also the prevention of the use of bad plaster, ought to be immediately attended to.

1941. You think that there should be further power given?—I think so, decidedly. In fact my opinion has been so strongly expressed to my board, that they are doing all they can to prevent semi-basements being built; they have refused permission to drain, though I do not know that they have that power, but they do so.

1942. You spoke of their having effected considerable sanitary improvement in their district?—Yes, ever since their formation.

1943. Has that been done at the expense of the landlords?—Yes, always.

1944. Did it amount to a considerable percentage on the value of the houses?—We take a bit every year almost. We do not go in for a sudden putting of everything into thorough order and condition at once, so that I can hardly tell what it would amount to. Perhaps last year the owners would have to do repairs, and they cleaned and whitewashed the houses. In addition to that, the traps and other structural works would cost 40 *s.* per house; not more.

1945. Have any of these houses been built by building societies?—I think not.

1946. Are they wholly belonging to owners of more or less size who let them to tenants?—Yes; the land societies buy largely, and they are large holders of property in my district; but I do not think any of the building societies have built at all. When the building societies take a piece of land, and a good deal of this land was taken by building societies, the houses are generally built by speculative builders or the members.

1947. Have they been built by members of building societies?—Yes, a good many upon some parts of the Clapton Park estate have been built in that way.

1948. Built by artizans who are owners of their own houses?—Yes, a considerable number.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

1949. Can you give an idea what number of houses have been built in that way?—No, I only had notice of being called to give evidence at six o'clock last night, and I have not had time to look into anything.

Mr. *Rankin.*

1950. Are there many of these houses in the district of Hackney Wick that are empty?—Not a very large number; our empties amount altogether to about five or six per cent.

1951. Is there a considerable number of the working classes still coming out to live in them from the centre of the town?—Yes, we are over built; we have plenty of room and plenty of houses.

1952. Do the people dislike having to come out to these houses?—I think the women and children enjoy it very much. The North London Railway Company will not grant workmen's tickets; it is a great shame; they have no opposition, and got control of the traffic. A large number of artizans and labourers use the North London Railway to travel to and from Homerton and Victoria Park stations to get to these houses.

1953. You think the labourers, if they could get dwellings equally cheap and commodious, would not look upon it as a hardship having to live out of the centre of the town?—I think not, and I should discountenance as far as possible, overcrowding in the centre of London, and would advocate the carrying of the people to the outside, provided the buildings are properly looked after.

1954. Do you think the death-rate would be lower?—Our death-rate is certainly low, even with this large amount of immigration. I may answer the question by giving the death-rate for a few years past, which will show that in spite of the enormous number of artizans in our district, causing our poor rates to increase, but we have not increased our death-rate. Our death-rate for 10 years from 1871 to 1880, was $19\frac{6}{10}$ per thousand for the whole district. Taking 1876 it was only $18\frac{5}{10}$; in 1877 it was $19\frac{3}{10}$; in 1878 it was $20\frac{2}{10}$; in 1879 it was $18\frac{8}{10}$; and in 1880 it was $18\frac{3}{10}$; so that we have certainly a low death-rate.

1955. You spoke of the district of which the death-rate was 32·9?—That was in one year; I do not think it is anything like that now, since we have improved it by sanitary measures.

1956. How was it that those houses were allowed to be inhabited if they were so defective?—They were not so defective that I could prevent their being inhabited.

1957. There is power to condemn a house, is there not, before it is inhabited?—I never knew of such a thing in my district; I have condemned many inhabited houses, and shut them up under the Nuisances Removal Act.

1958. Is there any authority in the metropolitan district to condemn a house before it is inhabited?—The district surveyor, if a wall is improperly built; and (it has been done in some instances) has ordered a wall to come down, and it has been pulled down, but I do not look upon a wall as a house.

1959. Does not his power extend to the sanitary arrangements of a house?—No, a sanitary inspector can serve a notice as regards the sanitary arrangements, by order of the sanitary authority, requiring the drains and other matters to be put into proper order and condition, and that is what we do.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

1960. Is it no part of the duty of the sanitary authority to see that the houses, before they are occupied, are properly arranged?—No; I have no power inside a house until it is occupied; I am speaking of myself as sanitary medical officer. The surveyor to the sanitary authority has power, and he uses it in our district in order to see proper drains put in now, but that has not been always the case.

1961. You say the surveyor of the sanitary board has power over the drainage of houses?—Yes, full power.

1962. In future his power will be exercised upon insanitary houses; they will not be allowed to be erected?—It depends upon whether they have inspectors for that purpose; we have two inspectors, who do very little else than look to house drains, one does nothing else, and he is assisted by another.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

1963. Does this power you speak of, reside with the local vestry?—The vestry is the sanitary authority for one parish, the board of works is the sanitary authority for two or more parishes, united; so that the vestry and the board of works may be taken as synonymous in respect to that power.

1964. When you spoke of the two inspectors, are they inspectors of the vestry, or inspectors of the board of works?—The vestry has no sanitary power in my district, because there is a board of works.

1965. The Metropolitan Board of Works?—No, the Hackney Board of Works, consisting of the representatives of the vestries of Hackney and Stoke Newington. There are 56 or 57 upon the board, and a certain number of them come from Stoke Newington and a certain number from Hackney; the board of works and vestries have the power of enforcing the Metropolitan Local Management Act, and all the other Sanitary Acts.

1966. Then the enforcement of the Sanitary Acts is, in local matters, entrusted to the board of works?—It is so in Hackney

1967. Then as regards the Building Acts, they are put in force, are they not, by the Metropolitan Board of Works?—Yes, we have nothing to do with those.

1968. Have you any suggestions to make for the improvement of the Metropolis Building Acts, or do you consider them sufficient?—I do not consider them sufficient; I think as regards the plaster used inside houses that that should be altered. I think that some certificate should be given to show that the district surveyor has been satisfied with the work when it is done, and I do not think so much work should be allowed to be done as is done without some inspection. Builders often run up houses at such a rate; I have watched them sometimes; I have seen the district surveyor go in, directly his back has been turned the work has gone on at a great rate; in the damp-

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

damp proof courses, instead of using whole slates and putting them through, cracked and broken slates are sometimes used in poorer places. I think that no damp-proof course should be covered without the surveyor seeing it. I have seen a house built in an open sewer and no damp-proof course put in, because there was no power to compel it till 1879.

1969. Would you like those powers to remain vested in the Metropolitan Board of Works, or would it work better if they were enforced by the local authority?—I think the supervision of all structural works as regards building, should remain with the Metropolitan Board of Works, but there should be a sufficient number of district surveyors. In my district, where there are 800 houses built in a year, there is a difficulty in the surveyor attending sufficiently often.

1970. Does the surveyor act with the sanitary authority of the Board of Works?—No.

1971. Is there not a disadvantage in that, that there should be two authorities of that kind acting in an isolated way?—London is such a big place that I do not think the same thing would apply in London as would apply outside; for Tottenham, I think, it should not be separate; but in an immense place like London I am in favour of separation.

1972. Should not the inspector of the Metropolitan Board of Works put himself in communication with the sanitary authority of the district, so that the sanitary authority might let him know where the houses were built of a certain kind which were likely to give trouble to the vestry?—The sanitary authorities get the first notice before draining houses. The Act says, before beginning to lay the foundation of a house notice must be given to the vestry or board for permission to drain; therefore the first information is given to the local board or vestry, and their surveyor knows about it; before the foundations are put in the builders ought to give us notice.

1973. Who ought to give you notice?—The builders.

1974. Then how does the Metropolitan Board of Works get notice?—I suppose the builder has to give notice, but I cannot answer as to that.

1975. Then these houses you speak of that are bad houses, built in your district, were built before the Act of 1879?—That is so.

1976. Would that Act of 1879 have effectually stopped the insanitary condition of these houses?—It would to a very great extent. The houses that were built upon a dust heap had concrete under the walls; but there was nothing between the walls; from my experience of other parts of the district where houses had been built upon dust-heaps, by covering in the whole of it with six inches of good concrete, which they are bound to do now, the smell is effectually kept down.

1977. As to the inhabitants of these houses, you spoke of some costermongers; whereabouts do they live; in the Clapton estate?—Yes, and in a place called Ottaway-street a large number of the costermongers live; that is near Hackney Downs.

1978. Where do they go for their work; do they find their work in the neighbourhood?—The costermongers do to a great extent, but not altogether. I have heard of costermongers

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

trading in Clerkenwell and Holborn, coming to the Hackney district to live.

1979. Do they live in the centre of London and come to you?—No, many live in our part and go to Clerkenwell or Holborn or other places to sell their goods.

1980. Where a large number of working men spring up, are the costermongers necessary?—Yes, but they are dirty in their habits.

1981. How do they manage with regard to markets. Are there cheap markets within reach?—No, not to all parts of the district. Spitalfields Market is a long way off; the Stratford Market was lately opened; Columbia Market was an utter failure; these are the only markets near us.

1982. Then they go from your district to the Stratford Market?—The costermongers, to a great extent, get their supplies from Billingsgate, and also Spitalfields, which is the nearest, I believe; they also go to Stratford.

1983. You spoke of the North London Line; do you know whether any workmen's trains are run upon that line?—No.

1984. Do you approve of the principle of workmen's trains?—Undoubtedly; I think it should be extended to later hours, both morning and evening. The workmen come home to our part very late. I am told by our inspectors that they often come home in large numbers up to 12 o'clock at night

1985. On the Great Eastern Line they are compelled to run workmen's trains, are they not?—Yes.

1986. And you think the obligation should be more general?—Yes.

1987. As regards Tottenham, you spoke of the condition of those houses?—Only of one block.

1988. Do you know what arrangements there are for looking after the sanitary condition for the district of Tottenham?—Yes; they have a good officer of health and a very active surveyor. I have seen numerous cases of fines, and orders to pull down property, in consequence of the action taken by the surveyor.

1989. Have they any Building Act?—They have bye-laws, which are much more stringent than those of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

1990. How is it that there are so many unhealthy houses there?—They apparently went to sleep, until comparatively lately.

1991. They are suffering from not having put that Act in force soon enough?—Yes, that is so; it was a sleepy village, until comparatively lately.

1992. Do you know anything about the other outlying villages like Edmonton?—I cannot say that I do.

1993. Or St. James's-street?—I have been through them, but not to look at the houses.

Mr. *William Holms.*

1994. You referred to an area of 10 acres being occupied by some 2,000 persons?—There are more than 2,000 persons now.

1995. You referred to that as a comparatively unhealthy area?—Yes.

1996. To what do you attribute the unhealthiness of that area; to the bad situation, or overcrowding?—I attribute it partly to the habits of the people; they are a very low class; a large proportion of them came from the centre

Mr. *William Holms*—continued.

of the City, and their habits are worse than those of the denizens of Hackney; they have been living in unhealthy localities, and the children have no power of resistance of disease the same as those living in the open air. We have not had such a changeable population lately. It is almost surrounded by open land. I have not taken out the death-rate since 1877, but I should say that the death-rate is much lower now.

1997. With regard to those people living in the healthy area, have you any idea how far they go to their work; are they near the place where they are employed?—No, many work a considerable distance away, and they come home by train; it is not the men who died there so much as the women and children who came from the unhealthy localities, the men going backwards and forwards are in very fair health.

1998. But the other people living there go a considerable distance to their work?—Yes, many of them.

1999. Have you many empty houses in Hackney suitable for artizans or labourers?—Yes, a good many. I should think that certainly five or six per cent. of the whole, if not more, are empty.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2000. Since the passing of the Building Act in 1878, have you observed any improvement in the buildings?—Decidedly.

2001. And are the bricks and mortar better than they were formerly?—Yes, certainly.

2002. You spoke about the damp-proof course; is it not the duty of the district surveyor to see that there is always a damp-proof course now?—I do not think that they compel the parties to keep it open till they see it; they may see the outside of it, but if there is a course of bricks upon it, they cannot see what it is.

2003. That is the law, and it is their duty to do so?—Yes.

2004. They would be failing in their duty if they did not look at it; you know that that is the law?—Yes, I know that that is the law.

2005. And you are aware that there should be concrete foundations also?—Yes.

2006. Would not you, if you saw a building in your district built on a dust heap and that sort of stuff, immediately report it as improper?—Yes, that has been done; the district surveyor has come down, and I have been present when the foundation was opened, and it was found that the appearances were occasioned by the carelessness of the workmen, sprinkling over this when wet some of the inferior matter.

2007. You think generally the Act of 1878 has worked well?—Yes.

2008. But you think the power ought to be still further increased?—Yes.

2009. Are you aware that the Metropolitan Board of Works at various times tried to increase their power, but have not always succeeded?—I gave evidence upon that matter, and was dreadfully cross-examined when I expressed an opinion that they should have those powers.

2010. You think they ought to have the power, in a sanitary point of view, for the benefit of the inhabitants of the metropolis?—Yes.

2011. You told us that the houses which were

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

built before the Act of 1878 were not in good condition, comparing those with the houses the poor people live in in the slums, which would be the best for their health?—Decidedly they are better now, because in a very short time the walls dry, and the bricks dry, and all offensive matter ceases to be given off from the plaster, and the result is that by looking after the sanitary arrangements, the houses get into a comparatively sanitary good state.

2012. And your experience is that in coming out into the country the women and children generally improve in health?—Yes.

2013. Have you heard any complaints from the bread-winners, the men having to come from that distance?—No.

2014. You never heard of them complaining of being obliged to get up half an hour earlier for the purpose of going to work?—No; if they get the facilities and the price they want for travelling, I believe they much prefer it.

2015. Generally, I gather from your evidence, you think it is desirable that the men, women, and children should go out into the suburbs rather than that they should remain in these dreadful places, the slums?—No doubt; there is only one bread-winner to four or five other people; you improve the health of the growing population, with little extra labour to the bread-winner, by enabling him to live away from the centre of London.

2016. Are the sites of the better houses, that is, the areas within the external walls, generally covered with concrete?—Yes, where they have made foundations; in the other and better class built on solid ground they are not; but where there are made foundations they have to be covered with six inches of concrete, and I instruct my inspectors, if that is not done, to report it to me.

2017. You were asked a question about the difference between the duties of a district surveyor and the vestry; you do not find any clashing in their duties at all, do you?—Their duties are so distinct that there should be no clashing.

2018. The vestry or district board looks after the drainage of the houses; and the district surveyor looks after the building of houses?—Yes.

2019. They each work in their own way, and cordially together?—I don't know about cordiality.

2020. Have you known any instance of the reverse?—No, I cannot say that I have.

2021. You have got one dreadful district under you, and that is Hackney Wick?—Yes.

2022. Is that district improving?—Decidedly; a great many of better class of houses have been built there within the last two years.

2023. I gather from what you say that they get comfortable houses round about there, in which families get two or three rooms for 2 *s.* 6 *d.* a week?—No; 2*s.* 6 *d.* a week for one room; they may get some rooms for 2 *s.*, but we have very few single room occupations. Two rooms in our district can be got at 3 *s.* 6 *d.*, 4 *s.*, 4 *s.* 6 *d.*, and 5 *s.* 6 *d.*, according to what the sizes may be, but they are very small at 3 *s.* 6 *d.*; two fairly good rooms can be got at 5 *s.* 6 *d.*

2024. I may say that practically they got double the accommodation outside that they would

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

would in the places they live in in the slums?—I should think so.

Mr. *Rankin.*

2025. As to the size of the rooms, you said the rooms were very small; I should like to know what dimensions you consider to be a very small room?—We have measured some 5,000 houses in our parish, and the whole of the rooms in them, and we calculate at the rate of 300 cubic feet per person for a sleeping room, and 400 cubic feet for living and sleeping; so that we do not look so much to the absolute size of the room as to the people in it; I suppose that the averagr sized rooms will run about 800 to 1,200 cubic feet, and many more.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

Monday, 27th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Mr. Hastings.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.

The Right Honourable Sir RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, in the Chair.

Mr. William Keating, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2026. Do you live at 21, Princes-row, Newport Market?—Yes.

2027. You are a silver plater, I believe?—Yes.

2028. Have you a place of your own, or do you work for somebody else?—I work for an employer.

2029. Where does he live?—He lives in Albion-road, Wandsworth.

2030. How long have you been a silver plater?—More than 30 years.

2031. Does your son work with you?—Yes, he is serving his time.

2032. How long have you lived in Newport Market?—Close on eight years or more, round the Market, that is, between Princes-row and Butchers'-alley; I lived close upon 18 months there, and close upon seven years at the other place.

2033. Do you know the neighbourhood very well?—Yes.

2034. Where is it the best for you and your family to live?—Where it is most convenient to have my meals comfortable with my children. I have had experience of living in Camberwell for about 18 months, or close upon that, and the inconvenience was something considerable, and it would be worse now, as the children are growing up, and one working here and another there.

2035. How many children have you?—I have five, and two are at work. The one tea does at breakfast time for the lot; whereas you would have to make three teas, and it would be an extra expense, and I get no more money.

2036. What made you go to live at Camberwell when you went?—I thought I would see if I could manage living outside a bit; but I found that it was uncomfortable in case sometimes I could not get a tram to get in to work, and I was not required to be in at six o'clock; and if I went by the workman's train I should have to stop in London before I could get in to work, waiting upon the line, or go into a public-house or a coffee-house, which would create more expense than I could afford to meet under the circumstances.

2037. Did you find your house or your lodgings that you got at Camberwell as good or worse than those that you have been living in in London?—Something on the same footing.

Chairman—continued.

2038. And was the expense of the lodgings themselves greater or less?—Less in one case; that is, if I walked the expense would have been less, but if I had to ride, of course the expense would be increased.

2039. And of course the expense would be increased still more if more members of your family had to come in to work?—Yes.

2040. Used you to go home to dinner when you lived at Camberwell?—No, I could not do that; I was obliged to have it in the shop. I was never used to it; I was always used to going home and having my dinner comfortably. The reason of my going to Camberwell was that my wife died, and I had no regular person to see after me or the children, and I thought it would be best out there.

2041. Have you any means of knowing what the feeling of your neighbours may be upon this matter?—I have very good cause to know about that; the people seem to be upset altogether in my idea; they really do not know what to do.

2042. What has upset them?—The uncertainty where they are to go, what places they have to get, and what rent they will have to pay.

2043. You are speaking of their being upset in consequence of taking down these houses?—Yes, inasmuch as the evil that existed by the throwing down of the houses which has occurred lately has brought an influx of some of the worst characters; and we have an addition of those who are a great deal worse than those that were there before, and if they improve Princes-row without providing a suitable place for the people, you will only scatter them about all over London. Now I can safely say, from my own experience, that I know some cases where people cannot get room; I experienced the difficulty myself sometimes. The first question I asked was, "What is the rent?" and I was told 10*s.* for two rooms; I could not afford to pay 10*s.* a week, because my wages are very uncertain. I am upon piecework; one day I earn a greater sum, and another less; and the next week the same, so that I have nothing that I can regularly depend upon as a regular stipend. Then they asked me the question, "How many children?" then when I told them, they said, "We cannot have you at all;" but in Princes-row,

Chairman—continued.

row, when they turned the people out from Short's Gardens, Drury Lane, and round there, these people, not providing for themselves as they might have done, and not being able to get places to live in, in some cases there have been 12 sleeping in a room in a night. Now those that were respectable in the house would not know that, because they would take care to be quiet over head; but still the evil existed; and if that is unhealthy in that case, it will not only affect the family where they sleep, but must affect the rest of the people in the house.

2044. Has the overcrowding increased since some of these places have been pulled down?—Most decidedly; a room will not be idle five minutes before it is taken, or one person takes a room and then takes other persons in under them, and you do not know who lives in a house.

2045. Can you see any spirit of discontent amongst the people in consequence?—Not a spirit of rebellion; it is not that, but a great discontent.

2046. I do not mean rebellion, but discontent with the present state of things?—Yes, and I do not believe that the payment of money to men for leaving would satisfy them; they would be glad to get so much money to leave, but they would spend that money, and it would not do any ultimate good as far as I can make out.

2047. Have you had any experience of these buildings, either the Peabody Buildings or the Waterlow Buildings?—I never resided in one of them, because I have a great objection to them.

2048. What is your objection to them?—There are too many restrictions to my mind. Every Englishman's house ought to be his castle.

2049. What kind of restrictions do you refer to?—You are supposed to be in at a certain time, and the gas is put out at a certain time, and you must not put a nail in and hang a picture; the working class are very fond of pictures. I am one of that sort myself; I cannot pass a picture shop without stopping and looking at them, and consequently I like to have them hung up in my own place.

2050. And they will not allow you to hang up your pictures upon the walls in those places?—No. Another thing, I have an idea that they are more like hospitals or barracks.

2051. Not a home?—No.

2052. There is not a feeling of home?—No.

2053. But cannot have much of the feeling of home in these overcrowded places?—No, but I wish to have an improvement.

2054. Have you many costermongers living in your neighbourhood?—They are chiefly costermongers.

2055. Could they live in these Waterlow or Peabody Buildings?—There is almost a necessity of having buildings in the centre of the town for these people to live in. For instance, artizans will not like to live with costermongers in a certain sense. In the first place, they take away too much water, and everybody likes a sufficient supply of water for themselves. But supposing a man is selling whelks, it involves a great deal of washing and boiling; and then flowers and washing vegetables, and all that sort of thing, one party in the house takes almost all the water,

Chairman—continued.

and the others have to go or send their children anywhere else, where they can possibly get water.

2056. In your opinion, some of these buildings ought to provide places for the costermongers, with room for their barrows?—Yes, and to keep them in some sort of regularity, which could be done under proper management. I take a very great interest in them; it is not because I am not a costermonger myself but a mechanic; but living with them so long, I have taken a great interest in them; the circumstances that they are placed in make them bad.

2057. Do you think the costermongers could go out to Camberwell, or Walthamstow, or any where into the suburbs?—It would be very inconvenient; that is, from what I have heard in speaking to them myself. I have rather a confidential way of speaking to them, privately, and quietly; I have got a way of getting in with them; and in the first place, they tell me that they have to come up to the markets here to get their wares, whatever it is they are in the habit of selling; that is labour enough, and they have to get up very early; supposing they live in Princes-row, they have to get up sometimes at four o'clock to go to Covent Garden to buy, and there is such a number of people buying, that everybody has to wait for their turn. Then after all that labour, they have to go home where they live, and clean these things, and get them ready and presentable for the public; and then they have to travel all over London to hotels and different private houses to sell them, so that consequently, I think, the costermonger is quite as necessary a class as almost any other working class of society.

2058. What time do they start out to sell, after they have been home and washed their goods?—It is according to what they sell; if they sell watercress they have to go out about six o'clock; if they sell at the market such as turnips and onions, and that sort of thing, they do not go out so early, about nine o'clock or half-past eight.

2059. Is it their custom, first to go out and buy their goods in the markets, then to come home and clean them, and afterwards to go out again?—Yes.

2060. So that they could not go off into the country to clean them?—No.

2061. Do they breakfast after they come home from buying, or breakfast before going out in the morning?—I believe that after buying the goods, before they start, it is their habit of having breakfast.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

2062. Are those costermongers who sell fish and whelks out late at night as well?—Yes.

2063. So that if they lived outside London, there would be a difficulty in their getting out to their residences?—Yes, very great difficulty. If a man is selling whelks, he starts out with his whelks about five or half-past five in the afternoon; then he perhaps is on his feet at a regular stand until about half-past 11 and sometimes 12 o'clock, then he has to get home and dispose of what remains, and put his barrow away.

2064. You

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

2064. You said just now that the costermongers used rather too much water to please the other lodgers; is there a constant supply where you are living?—I cannot say that I have got much fault to find with the supply that the company send, but if one man takes more than his share the others must go with less.

2065. Do you know what a constant supply means; it means when the water is always running; have you a constant supply at your house?—Only the same as any other place; the cistern is filled, that is all. If there was a constant supply of water, the other difficulty would be obviated.

2066. You have spoken of the overcrowding arising from people coming in who have been displaced in other parts; is there any check upon that overcrowding by Government officials or inspectors?—There would be a check were it known, but one party in the house does not like to inform on the other, because they would get a bad name if they made complaints of that sort, and very likely get into disgrace.

2067. Do not they come round at night and make unexpected visits?—No; in such a neighbourhood as this, to my mind, they seem to be neglected altogether. I know they pay visits to certain acknowledged lodging-houses, but not to private houses.

2068. You have spoken of the feeling of discomfort rather than of discontent amongst the people around you as to their chance of having to move; does this arise from the fear lest they should have to move out to a distance from where their work now is?—Yes; I should rather think it was the uncertainty. I heard a remark from a family who live in our parlours; they have occupied the parlours and the kitchens for 33 years, and the woman has a stall in Newport Market, facing Rockleigh's, the grocers, and she has been there about that time. Now, her husband goes out in the afternoon with whelks, so that you see they have had a regular place of business for years, and are doing well, and live well; this, again, upsets them. Of course Newport Market as a market would be destroyed altogether, consequently their living would be very uncertain after this.

2069. To sum up your evidence, you would like to see, if possible, some dwellings erected in that place which could be inhabited by costermongers, and enable them to carry on their business there?—Yes, I should. For instance, this man that sells the whelks, he has to go early in the morning to Billingsgate; they have been talking of removing Billingsgate Market further off, and that would be worse again for him.

Mr. *Cropper*.

2070. Your master lives at Wandsworth, I understand?—Yes.

2071. You are working now close to your own place?—Yes.

2072. I understand you do not think that putting up fresh blocks of buildings like the Peabody or Waterlow Buildings would help you or the people you talk about?—They would if there was provision made for their wares.

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

2073. But not under the arrangements that exist now?—No, not at all.

2074. Therefore, any change would be against them?—It would be against them unless properly provided for.

2075. And any change in the market would be against them?—I think so. But what I think is, that previous to these people being turned out, there ought to be a place ready for them to go into. If that difficulty was met, you would get over almost all other difficulties.

2076. I was talking of the costermongers?—Yes.

2077. Supposing they remove the market, it would be no use making them a place where they now are. If the market is going to be removed, it will be no use making a place for them, because they will have to follow the market?—They would have to find that out. Public business could not stand for that. If there is a necessity for having fresh places, something else will crop up in that way for them; they must find it out; the same as if I lost my job where I work, I should have to go and get another place, though I should not like it.

2078. Therefore they would look out for business for themselves, if their place of trade goes away?—Yes.

2079. And then you think that the best way to assist them would be to give them a sum of money to go and look for such places?—If a man was in business like that, and had an uncertainty in the way of his living, it would be wise to give him something; but I shall not be sorry for Princes-row being taken down, provided proper places are put up for these people to live in as well as myself.

2080. Have you known many people who have received sums of money to leave their homes?—I have known some.

2081. I suppose they find other homes?—Yes; one got 10*l.*, and she moved to a place and was not a couple of weeks there, when she had to leave that and to go to another, and from that to another, and then all the 10*l.* was wasted in moving and one thing and another, so that it did not do her any good; and they were very well-to-do people.

2082. We have to take for granted that these great improvements have to be made in London?—Yes; there is a necessity for that.

2083. And I gather from you that there is no other way of compensating these people, and enabling them to find other places?—This class cannot get fresh rooms because other people will not live with them. If they were to live in Compton-street, the people in the houses there would not like a costermonger to take all their water away, and they would not like to live with costermongers; and if there was any block or space provided for the costermonger somewhere towards the centre, near the markets, then it would meet the difficulty.

2084. You admit that it would be impossible to make the blocks of Waterlow's or Peabody's buildings so as to take costermongers in, because they would be an annoyance to the inhabitants?—As they stand now; if you could make one suitable, it would be a different thing.

2085. They

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

2085. They could not live up in the high buildings?—No.

2086. Therefore, if the market is to be removed, and these people have to go, you admit that the only way is to give them money to find other places?—I do not like the money business; I would rather see a place for them to live in.

Sir *Matthew Ridley.*

2087. You spoke of having gone to Camberwell some time ago, and you know of others having gone out into the suburbs; has the question of health ever entered into your consideration at all; did you find your young children healthier than in the crowded streets?—Neither the children nor myself enjoyed better health than at present.

2088. You do not think there is much to be said on the ground of improved health or healthier dwellings; that does not enter into your consideration?—Not according to my experience. I have enjoyed as good health in London as I did outside. In fact, I do not know whether it can be attributed to my being a teetotaller; that has a great deal to do with it.

2089. Were you a teetotaller both in London and in the suburbs?—No, I was not in the suburbs; I used to drink in the suburbs; of course I speak what I believe to be the truth.

2090. But you know other people about you; you do not think that it enters into their consideration, that it is some balance for the disadvantages of having to come a distance to their work, so as to live in better air outside these crowded streets?—My opinion is, it is all very well for a man to have fresh air to sleep in of a night-time, but what is he to do in the day-time. He is in the bad air in the day time, and then if it is raining or snowing, he has to sit in his wet clothes all the day in a close shop, so that what good he might receive from the benefit of fresh air would be all lost in the day, and he would not have his comfortable meals, and supposing they took so much money with them to get their dinner, some of the men instead of getting their dinner would spend the money on what they ought not to, and neglect getting it; whereas, if they have to go home, their dinner is provided for them and they would eat it, according to my notion of it.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2091. You told us that when you were living at Camberwell, you had a difficulty sometimes in getting a tram to bring you into your work in the morning?—Yes.

2092. What time did you leave home?—I was not obliged to leave home at any particular time, but sometimes being on piecework, I would like to get in rather earlier some mornings.

2093. What hour do you call a little earlier?—Perhaps I would want to get in at eight o'clock in the morning, and I could not get a tram then; from where I lived, I could not catch the trams running there from New Cross.

2094. Were not the trams running at eight o'clock in the morning?—They are supposed to start at eight o'clock and I could not catch them.

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

2095. There were not enough of them?—No.

2096. Was there any railway accommodation?—There was railway accommodation, but it would take me to Ludgate, and I should have as far to walk as though I walked all the way; so that it would be no use my taking the rail, and then I would have to start at six o'clock, and walk about until I might get into the shop to work.

2097. Did you find the travelling by tram cars, a very expensive burden upon you every week?—No, not particularly expensive; it all depends upon the state of the pocket at the time; sometimes it was not in a very flourishing condition.

2098. Have you had any experience of living in these model lodging-houses yourself?—No personal experience, but I judge from what others have told me.

2099. You have known people who have lived in them?—I have known several.

2100. Are they of the same class as you have been mentioning, costermongers?—No.

2101. They are a class superior to that?—They suppose themselves superior, mechanics.

2102. As a matter of fact you do not think they are superior; they are of the same class as those living in the dwellings outside?—I think the artizan always reckons himself superior to the costermonger.

2103. Do you find that, owing to overcrowding, the rents for the dwellings outside the model dwelling houses have increased?—I have done so, decidedly, because the more pressure there is for private places to live in, the more the market goes up in price.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2104. You said in answer to a question of the honourable Member for Midhurst, that you thought the people who were living in private houses were not looked after in the same way as those who were in the public lodging-houses, and that you did not think there was the same inspection?—When I talk of lodging-houses, I mean such as the lodgings where you can get a bed of a night for 6 *d.* or 4 *d.*, as the case may be; of course they are inspected.

2105. I thought I understood you to say, that the people who live in other houses were not subjected to that sort of inspection?—They are not looked after, because the authorities are not aware of these things existing.

2106. Would the people who live in these other houses be satisfied to be so looked after or inspected?—I should not think they would.

2107. Therefore the remedy for over-crowding in these houses cannot be sought in the direction of police inspection?—No.

2108. What is the remedy?—The remedy is building places for them.

2109. Where does the flush of over-crowding come from to Newport Market?—The Courts of Justice are somewhere about there.

2110. Was it at once perceptible that there was an increased demand for rooms when this demolition began?—Yes.

2111. Has there been any mitigation of it; have the people moved off?—No. The people have

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

have not been provided with a place to live at; that is what causes so many to come of a night. They say to the parties who live in the house, "I have nowhere to go to; I cannot get a place, you might let me sleep in your place;" perhaps a woman with two or three children, or perhaps the husband; that is not a very pleasant thing for others in the house.

2112. Could you name to the Committee any of the small streets in the neighbourhood which have been made worse by this overcrowding?—All the streets about have been made worse by it.

2113. Worse in point of physical comfort and decency?—Yes, it is like opening a hornet's nest.

2114. Some of the streets, I perceive, were tolerably decent and comfortable before?—Yes, before.

2115. And they are now slums?—Yes, exactly so.

2116. Have you noticed, since you were at Camberwell, the district about Peckham?—I lived close to there.

2117. Is it true, as has been stated publicly, that that district also, from the outflow from the centre of the town, has been much deteriorated?—I have not the slightest doubt of it; all places have.

2118. All the houses are crowded with families pretty much as they are in the thickest part of the town?—Just as much.

2119. And they were not so formerly?—They were not so formerly.

2120. What is the height of the houses?—We will say two storeys.

2121. Is there any reason why, in that great district, provision might not be made for suitable accommodation of four storeys high as well as for two storeys?—Such a thing is possible.

2122. Do you see any objection to it?—I cannot see objection, only in case of fire; the higher the place is, the more danger there is in getting out.

2123. But if double the provision were made, within reach of the centre of the town, would not the evil be materially mitigated; the district is a two-storied district, is it not?—Yes, you speak of outside London; I should think it would do for anyone who could live out; some people prefer to live out, but a great many do not like to live out.

2124. Taking those who live there now, would it not be better for them to have double the accommodation?—A good many of these people have Hobson's choice about going out; they must go out, as I was obliged, when I went to live in Camberwell.

2125. In your particular employment, you have a certain choice, working piecework, when you will begin the day's work and when you will leave off?—Generally so.

2126. But in many trades that is not so?—That is right.

2127. In many of the trades in skilled labour the work begins at half-past six or seven?—Yes.

2128. In winter weather, and hard weather, is it not a great aggravation of the position of these people to have to come by tram or on foot?—I think it is a great inconvenience; in fact, I have known death to ensue through persistence in coming through the wet and cold, and then standing all day in wet clothes.

2129. I want to ask you a question, and I want you to answer it very carefully. Have you observed, for instance, amongst your neighbours and mates, numerous cases of what is called pulmonary disease, that is diseases of the chest and throat, arising from exposure?—I have noticed that people have suffered from that, but I cannot see what it would have to do with living in the country.

2130. Have you seen it with regard to women living by out-door work?—Not particularly.

2131. When the family are transferred from the centre of the town, and the work of the head of the family still remains in town, so that he has to go into town during the day; if his wages are insufficient to support the whole of the family, can the wife generally obtain work in aid, and help the common stock in the suburban districts?—I do not think they have as good an opportunity as they have in the centre of the town.

2132. Do you know of any cases where they come into town to look for work?—No, I do not.

2133. Then they must either give up the auxiliary work or come into town to secure it?—Yes.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2134. What are your hours of work?—I go in about nine o'clock in the morning to eight at night.

2135. That is in general, is it?—That is in general; but if they require me in at seven o'clock or six o'clock, I go.

2136. Were they the same hours when you lived at Camberwell?—Yes.

2137. You said you were obliged to go out to Camberwell?—Yes, I did.

2138. Why was that?—Previous to going out to Camberwell I lived in Drury-lane, facing the Middlesex Music Hall, and the landlord required the place, and I had to find a place where to live. I took up a newspaper, and I noticed there was a house to be let so-and-so at a certain rent, so I said to my brother, here is a chance for us, we will go on Sunday and look at the place, and I took the house; the rent was 5 *s.* a week for four rooms.

2139. Did you occupy all the rooms yourself?—My brother and his family and myself and children.

2140. What rent do you pay now?—6 *s.* a week.

2141.—How many rooms?—Two; back and front.

2142. Then Camberwell is very much cheaper?—It was cheaper in rent, but dearer otherwise.

2143. You said you had two children out at work?—Yes.

2144. Do they work in your neighbourhood?—One works in the same shop as I do, serving his time, and the other works in Frith-street.

2145. They all work in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

2146. As regards the wife going out to work, do you think it a good thing that the wife of an artizan,

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

artizan, with a family, should go out to work?—I think it is a very great evil myself, unless there is a positive necessity for it; if the earnings are not sufficient to keep the children, then it becomes a necessity, and we are obliged to do what we would not like to do otherwise.

2147. Have you formed any view as to what wages an artizan can earn which shall make it unnecessary for the wife to go out to work; would it be necessary in the case of a labourer with three children on 1 *l.* per week, for the wife to work?—She would be obliged to work, because it would not keep the family and pay the rent.

2148. Supposing he earned 25 *s.*?—I do not think it would be sufficient.

2149. It must be something like 30 *s.*?—Yes, something like 30 *s.*, and then they have to be careful.

2150. But it would make a very great difference if they were teetotallers?—A very great difference. If you spend 10 *s.* on a Saturday night in drink, then there is only a pound, and then you borrow off the old woman for money to drink in the week; and I do not know how she would get on at all.

2151. You said that before the people were turned out, you thought places ought to be got ready for them in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

2152. How could it be done; is there any room to build houses in the neighbourhood?—I understand that the refuge school is moving away; I should think they could build a good block there.

2153. Then you have to destroy the refuge?—They are going away, so that there would be no destruction of it; it is an unsightly looking thing as it is.

2154. But in other cases, where you carry street improvements through a densely peopled quarter, it is very difficult to get places in which to put fresh houses?—I am aware of that; but I am aware still of the necessity of something being done to alleviate the misery of the poorer population of the city.

2155. And even supposing you reserved places to build up afterwards, you have to destroy the houses first to make the new street; it is exceedingly difficult to make an improvement without that?—There is a difficulty attached to that, but there are so many blocks of buildings erected already, and I understand there is a very great difficulty in getting into them; supposing you are an artizan, sometimes your name may be on the books three or six months before you can get a room.

2156. Are you speaking of model dwellings?—Yes; the difficulty attached to them, but I am only one, and there may be other mechanics that would prefer living outside. Now, if there were artizans' dwellings built outside, wherever it would be most convenient for the Board to erect them, it might suit them.

2157. Do you know any artizans who live about Edmonton and Enfield, on the Great Eastern line?—No.

2158. Are you aware that a number of artizans do live out there, and travel every day?—Yes, I am aware of that.

2159. Have you any friends who live out in the country?—I have a shopmate that lives out.

2160. How does he like it; does he find it convenient?—It is not convenient, but he does it for the sake of the children; when the children are all small, and are not out at work, it may suit him, but if he had three or four of his children working close to where he lived, he would find a disadvantage attached to the matter.

2161. It would be best for a man with a young family to live out in the country, and when the family grow older to come back to town?—I should think it would be, providing the children were seen after and had their meals properly; but it is very often the case when a man works in town and does not go home to meals, if he has a family, the wife thinks it is not worth while making a dinner for them, and she shoves it off with a pint of beer, and a bit of bread and cheese for the children, but if the man goes home they are bound to provide a regular dinner for all the lot at a much cheaper rate.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2162. How many live in your house, where you are now, in Princes-row?—About 18.

2163. Eighteen people, adults and children in six rooms?—Six rooms.

2164. That is rather close quarters, is it not?—Yes, it is.

2165. Then, when you were in Camberwell you were in much more comfortable quarters, so far as rooms went?—No, because the rooms were small, and I only occupied the same amount of rooms, with the same family.

2166. How many rooms were there?—Four rooms for two families; the rooms were much smaller than the ones I am living in now.

2167. Are they good rooms?—Yes, the rooms are good.

2168. Are they all full now?—All full now.

2169. They fill rapidly?—Yes.

2170. You complained that you could not get back from Camberwell; how far is Victoria Station from where you live or work; about a mile or a mile and a quarter?—I suppose it is half-an-hour's walk.

2171. You could have got to Victoria Station from Camberwell, could you not?—Yes, but where would that leave me?

2172. You were rather complaining of the distance?—Yes.

2173. I have got a paper here which shows me that a train would take you from Camberwell to Victoria Station?—I never went by that line. I was not aware of it. It is eight years ago or more, that I am speaking of, and there may be a difference now.

2174. There may be a fresh line made?—Yes.

2175. If there were fresh communications you would not object so much to live in the country?—I would object, because I could not get home to my dinner.

2176. You told one of these gentlemen that you thought Camberwell was a good deal crowded. I have a return here showing me that there were 95 houses vacant in Camberwell, and they might accommodate 1,140 people, so that those people who were turned out, could find accommodation

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

accommodation somewhere?—Yes; but the class that I have been speaking of as being turned out, would have to sit up all night to be up early in the morning, to get into market, and buy the things.

2177. I am not confining myself to costermongers; supposing we take in the artizans, surely they are not all costermongers, the artizans may do it; a man with a fair amount of wages could get in in the morning, could he not?—Yes, he could.

2178. You said, just now, that you would be satisfied at Newport Market, if a good block of buildings was built at the Newport Market Refuge; but what is the use of building it, if the people dispossessed from the district decline to go there; you say you would object to go?—Not if there were not so many restrictions; it is not the building that I object to so much as it is the restrictions.

2179. I heard you say that one restriction you disagreed with was that you could not hang a picture up; but have you inquired into the matter, because I find that in almost all the dwellings they have a strip of wood all round, on purpose to accommodate the people; are you not aware of that?—No, I am not aware of it.

2180. Then, as regard restrictions, I hold in my hand the rules of the Peabody Trustees.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

You object to the gas being turned off at 11 o'clock?—Yes.

2181. Are you not aware that each tenant is provided with a key to admit him at all hours when he likes?—He is provided with a key, but supposing I am put upon a committee or a deputation of an evening, and was not aware of it before I left home, and I had not the key, then a difficulty is attached to my getting in.

2182. All Members of the House of Commons would be in the same boat if they forgot their latch keys?—The gentlemen of the House of Commons can get home whenever they like. I may be taken suddenly unprovided.

2183. Have you had any warning given you. I believe your street is going to be taken?—We had eight weeks' notice, and I think that time has gone over.

2184. And you have had a little more time given you?—Yes.

2185. I have had a paper put in my hand, which says there are 300 unoccupied houses fitted for artizans down at Plumstead, so that you could have a very comfortable house there if you liked it?—If I had to go without a certain amount of food, I would rather live up in town close to my work than go there, but I do not suppose that we shall be put to that shift. I am sure the gentlemen of the Board will make up some place for us.

Mr. JOSEPH CHARLES KIRKHAM, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2186. You live, I believe, at 12, Lichfield-street, Soho?—Yes.

2187. What are you?—A painter.

2188. What shop do you work at?—Mr. Groombridge; 13, Conduit-street, Regent-street.

2189. How long have you worked for him?—Nine years last November.

2190. I believe you have some way of adding to your income?—Yes.

2191. What is that?—At the Haymarket theatre at night.

2192. What office do you hold at the Haymarket Theatre?—I am a dresser.

2193. What family have you?—Eight children.

2194. Are any of your children able to do anything?—Two of them.

2195. Two daughters?—Yes.

2196. How are they employed?—One works in Long-acre, and she has her meals out, and comes home to sleep, and the other works in St. Martin's-lane; she sleeps out, and comes home to meals.

2197. Have you always lived in that neighbourhood?—Nineteen years.

2198. I believe you once went to Battersea?—Yes, for four months.

2199. What did you want to go to Battersea for?—The benefit of the children.

2200. How long did you stay there?—Four months.

2201. Did you find the rents there were lower or higher?—Lower.

2202. For the same accommodation?—Yes, two rooms, but the rooms were not so large.

Chairman—continued.

2203. How did you come in to your work then?—By train, and if I missed the train, I walked.

2204. Were the rooms so much cheaper that they paid for the trains?—No, I found that the cost by train, and the not being able to go home to meals, and the extra time taken to walk home prevented me from doing my night work, so that I was out of pocket, and that made me come back to Soho.

2205. You seem to lay stress on having your meals together?—Yes.

2206. Is that cheaper and better?—Very much cheaper; if I do not have my dinner at home, I go to a cook shop, and I cannot get a dinner there under 10 *d.* or 1 *s.*, to do me any good, but the wife would get it for us all for that amount, or adding a little to it.

2207. Do you think it desirable that the bread winner should be with his family at meals?—Yes.

2208. Probably the family get better dinners in consequence?—Yes; because the wife would not trouble to get dinner for herself and children if the husband is not at home.

2209. How long is it since you were at Battersea?—About seven years ago.

2210. Is there much difficulty in getting rooms now, in the place where you live, about Soho?—There is a difficulty, and then, if you go after them, they will not take you, on account of the children; and the rent has gone up.

2211. What has made the rent go up?—On account of people flocking there for the rooms; they

Chairman—continued.

they must live somewhere; they do not want to go out of the neighbourhood if they can help it, and they have put the rent up.

2212. Is that in consequence of improvements being made, and the houses being taken down?—Yes.

2213. With regard to the employment you have, could you carry on the painting and theatrical business if you lived in the country?—No, not in Battersea.

2214. I suppose that some of the workpeople who are turned out might live with advantage in the country?—Not if they have a family; if it is only a man and his wife, and one child, they can; but if there is a family I do not see that there would be any advantage at all, and more especially if any of the family go out to work.

2215. Have you heard your mates say much about it?—Only the people in the house.

2216. These improvements must take place, and what suggestion would you make in order to alleviate the disturbance of the working classes?—I think a good block of lodging houses in the neighbourhood would be a very good thing.

2217. Have you ever lived in a model lodging house?—No.

2218. Should you object to do so?—Not at all.

2219. You do not mind the restrictions you have heard of?—I did not know there were such restrictions.

2220. You would be content to go there, but you have never lived there yourself?—No.

2221. How is it you have not tried?—The wife did try for it, in Drury-lane, but they are all full, and I think she tried to get in at Chandos-street.

2222. Are they new buildings?—Yes.

2223. You are of opinion that it would be a wise thing that some of these places should be put up when a great demolition takes place?—Yes, there are two very good plots that could be used for the purpose, one where the timber yard was at the corner of Lichfield-street and Grafton-street, and the other at the corner of Hayes-court, King-street, which have been empty for three or four years.

2224. What time have you to be at your work in the morning?—Half-past six.

2225. What time do you get off at night?—Half-past five, but it is often six o'clock.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2226. What rooms have you got?—I have two rooms.

2227. How many children have you?—Eight.

2228. What do you pay for the two rooms?—Eight and sixpence per week.

2229. How many people are there living in the same house that you live in?—There are only two families.

2230. But there are more people in the house?—Yes.

2231. I see there are six sets of people in the house?—Yes, but there is one besides myself who has a family.

2232. Do you consider the rent you pay high?—It is quite enough.

2233. Who is your landlord?—Miss Stanley.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

2234. Are the premises kept in good repair?—Yes.

2235. How long have you been living in that house?—Three years last November.

2236. Were you always charged 8 *s.* 6 *d.*?—Yes.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2237. When you were at Battersea, how did you come in to your work?—By train, when I caught it.

2238. Was the train accommodation good?—Very good.

2239. You do not know whether it has improved since?—I do not know.

2240. What did it cost you?—A workman's ticket, 2 *d.* return.

2241. And the trains ran up to what time in the morning?—The first workman's train was five minutes to six, and the last somewhere about seven o'clock in the morning.

2242. I want to know how many trains there were in the morning?—I cannot say. If I did not catch the five minutes to six train I used to walk, so as to get to the workshop in time.

2243. You said that men with a family could not live in the country; is it not much better for the children to live in the country?—Yes, if they get enough to eat.

2244. If the wages are sufficient?—Yes. The children out in the fresh air want more to eat, and the working man cannot give it to them.

2245. Were your children healthier in the country?—Yes.

2246. Then it is simply a question of wages. If a man has enough wages he may go into the country?—A man that can get enough wages may go a long way off to live. I should prefer it.

2247. What do you mean by enough money, if a man has four children?—A man with four children would want 35 *s.* a week. I should want 3 *l.* to live out of town.

2248. A number of workmen, you know, live out on the Great Eastern line belonging to a lower class of workmen than those who can earn even 35 *s.* a week; labourers?—I do not know anybody living out there.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2249. When you missed the six o'clock train, what did you do; walk?—Walk.

2250. Supposing it was bad weather, or you were not well, were there any other trains that would take you for 2 *d.*?—There might be one or two other trains, but if I waited for them I should lose my work; I should not get into the shop until half-past eight; by walking I could get in by seven o'clock in the morning.

2251. When you missed a train, and you could not walk, and you did not get in till half-past eight, what happened?—I lost my money.

2252. How much was struck off your wages?—Tenpence halfpenny.

2253. You could not afford that?—No.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2254. I suppose you perceive a great difference in the accommodation of dwelling-houses now as compared with ten or a dozen years ago; they

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

are much more over-crowded?—Much more over-crowded, and the rents much higher.

2255. Is there much dissatisfaction among those you come across as to the present overcrowding?—There is in the neighbourhood about the places coming down as to where they shall go to; but I do not know as to the overcrowding.

2256. There is dissatisfaction and difficulty, and expense, about getting a new house, is there not?—Yes.

2257. I believe that you would say, as we heard from another witness, that a man with a family always has greater difficulty in getting rooms as compared to another man without children?—Yes, I have experienced that.

2258. Not because he wants more room, but because a man with a family is objected to by the other lodgers?—My wife was trying, I think, for nearly two years to get apartments, and wherever she went, the objection was the family.

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

2259. But is the question whether you have a family or not asked by the landlord who has the rooms to let?—The landlord will ask you if you have any children, and you tell him, and he will say, "No, we do not take children," and turn you away directly, and shut the door in your face, as if you were begging.

2260. It is not a question of asking for so many rooms, and asking the rent; that is not all the information he requires?—The family is the principal objection.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2261. Have you observed any cases in which employers have tried to provide better accommodation for their workpeople near their work?—No, I have not.

2262. Have you ever heard what has been done by Crosse & Blackwell in Soho?—No, I have not.

Mr. JOHN FIELD, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2263. WHERE do you live?—At 45, Old-Compton-street.

2264. What are you?—A Painter and Plumber and House Decorator.

2265. Do you work for any great employer of labour?—Not now; I do jobbing work for myself.

2266. Have you a family?—Yes.

2267. How many children have you?—I have three children living.

2268. Are any of those out at work?—One; a girl.

2269. What is she doing?—She is a waitress.

2270. At some refreshment place?—Yes.

2271. Whereabouts?—In Compton-street.

2272. Does she live with you at home?—No, she is in lodgings.

2273. Has she her meals with you?—No.

2274. Have you any objection to the street being pulled down?—I think it is going to utter ruin for the want of something being done to it.

2275. Supposing it to be pulled down, what in your opinion ought to be done, so far as the working people who are disturbed are concerned?—I think there ought to be suitable dwellings erected to suit the classes turned out of the places.

2276. Do you think it would do for those people to be moved to the suburbs?—No, I do not; I think it would be a great inconvenience.

2277. Will you tell us why?—In the first place, I, as a working man, know very well how, at the time I used to have to go out to the Alexandra Palace, the trains used to be overcrowded of a morning, and I know what an evil it is if you should happen to lose a train. In my case I had either to walk or lose a quarter; and if you are on a job, and lose a couple of quarters in a week, they will take another man on; it does not matter to the foreman or the master; they say, "We cannot help it; we must have our time kept."

Chairman—continued.

2278. What sort of people inhabit Old Compton-street?—I might say that I have only been residing here for a short time; only since Christmas. Till then I was living in Chapel-place, Crown-street, over seven years.

2279. Where is Crown-street?—It is in a line with the new street.

2280. What class of artizans were living there?—Very poor indeed.

2281. What was their occupation?—Latterly, in anticipation of the new street, since the new street has been going on, when there was a room empty the landlord knew very well that the people were going about picking up rooms every day, and would offer any price for them. Within the last three years there has been a rise of one shilling on each room; and he would take all manner of trash in; they may refuse to take the children, but I know those who have deceived them; who said they had three children, and when they took the room they manage to have ten children; so that they have to get a room under a false representation.

2282. What kind of people are they; cabinet-makers?—Not there. They would not live in that class of property. It is a very unhealthy spot.

2283. What were they; labourers?—Labourers and costermongers; and a sweep lived there, and those kind of people.

2284. What kind of people live in Old Compton-street?—They are a pretty respectable class, altogether.

2285. Are they cabinet-makers?—I do not know what they may be; there are shopkeepers and artizans living in the apartments; it is a step higher. I had a long time tried to get to the place where I am living, but whenever I went after a lodging or a room, they used to say, "It is so much per week. Where are you living;" "So-and-So." In fact they do not care about taking you with such a reference; the name of the

Chairman—continued.

the place was almost against you getting a room anywhere else, and a damper would be on it if you said you had three children ; and I had four of them. I lost one of them in April.

2286. Do you think those places became more overcrowded in consequence of the demolitions that have taken place?—I am sure it is through the demolition of Bedfordbury, and Wild-street improvement, that that vicinity has become overcrowded.

2287. And the rent has been raised?—Yes; that has been the result of it. I have known a landlord saying to me, "I do not mind the room being empty; I can soon let it and get 6 *s.* for it if you go." I am speaking of Chapel-place, Crown-street; there is no sanitary accommodation there; you have to get your water from the pump; there is one pump at the top of the place to supply all the poor there, and the water is as stagnant as anything.

2288. Do you think some buildings ought to be put up in which these people can live?—Yes; I maintain that, and also I think it would be proper that these people that are now turned out of the houses should have the first privilege of occupying the newly-built houses; they come from all parts, and the rooms are swallowed up by total strangers.

2289. We will assume that the improvement must be made, and that a street ought to be pulled down; of course you cannot build up a new place, even if you wished to do it in a minute ; there must be an interval of 12 months before you could get a new house up; what would you do with the people in the meantime?—There is one place now pulled down to the ground ; it could be put in working order in a very short space of time ; where the Nightingale Board School was to be.

2290. You would take advantage of that, and put a block of these buildings upon it in order to be ready for the next set of people who were to be turned out?—I say before you pull down, you ought to erect some suitable dwellings whereby the people may be accommodated.

2291. Have you ever lived in the Peabody Buildings, or the Waterlow Buildings?—Never; but I have heard of the dealings of several of them.

2292. Have you any objection to them?—I have an objection to them, if it is all true that I have been told ; there is great restriction, and it is very hard to get in ; your name must be on the books two or three months before; and if your children are not vaccinated you cannot get in.

2293. Do you know any people living there?—Yes, I know several.

2294. They do not complain when they are once in?—No; but they are not the people who have been ousted from the old houses who are living there. If a thorough investigation took place, you would find that eight out of ten were strangers to the neighbourhood.

2295. What became of the people who were turned out of Wild Street and Bloomsbury?—They did the best they could ; one person in one room, and another person accommodating them in another room. Those turned out in Wild Street were lying out in the streets, about Drury Lane; they got accommodation from friends, and spent the pound or two they got in drink. They made a forcible entry into Orange Court, and they were turned out of the empty houses, after they were compensated by the Board of Works.

Chairman—continued.

2296. You do not think that giving a person 1 *l.* or 10 *l.* is a proper way of getting over the difficulty?—I do not agree with giving any compensation at all; I agree with providing new dwellings.

2297. Are you talking of any particular block of buildings?—Yes, Wild Street.

2298. There are plenty of places in the suburbs of London where there are houses which are not let, are there not?—Yes, I believe so; you can see them advertised ; columns full in "Lloyd's."

2299. Why do not the people go there?—Because they know the very great delay and expense, and the very great inconvenience it would be to go down to the suburbs.

2300. Will you explain why you object to go to the suburbs?—Because I should lose three parts of my work. I speak feelingly. I could never get backwards and forwards. Now I am on my work, to clean a ceiling here, or to mend a pipe that has burst, or to see to a drain that has been stopped up. I am at everybody's beck and call. I work for many householders in the neighbourhood. I am not doing so much now as I would have done, because they are anticipating the new street being made, and they will have very little done, so that things are going to ruination.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

2301. I rather gather that you have no personal objection to the Peabody Buildings, if you once get inside, but you object to the restrictions they make before they admit you?—I object to the state of Peabody Buildings as they are now. I should like them made in a different way altogether, so that it would enable the poorer classes, as well as the middle artizan, to be there, the 1 *l.* a week man, as well as the 2 *l.* a week man.

2302. That is another question, but I want first to ascertain what your objection to the Peabody Buildings is; is it to the restriction when you are once inside, or is it to the restriction before you get into the building?—When you once get in you would act up to the rule. You would not make an application to get in there, unless you intended to abide by the rules.

2303. What do you object to in the rules which you say are so stringent?—They are very stringent; they ought not to be so harshly dealt out. If a person wants rentage, or a room for himself and his family, and the reference is suitable from the last landlord, and he can give a satisfactory account of the reason why they make the application, it ought to be enough.

2304. That is as to the rule of admission. I ask as to whether you consider the restriction upon the tenants of the buildings are too stringent?—No, I do not think they are too stringent.

2305. The class who live in a cheaper place are not the class that could possibly go into the Peabody Buildings as at present existing?—No.

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

2306. What you would like to see is a class of buildings made to suit the circumstances of the lower class of people?—General dealers, and such like.

2307. Before a street is taken down, you would like a part of it devoted at once to this class of buildings?—Yes.

2308. If you took down part of a street first, though the evil is diminished, you still have to displace a certain number of people without having buildings for them?—Yes; there is a difference between displacing a certain number, and displacing the whole.

2309. You would diminish the evil?—Yes, you might have 103 or 200 yards pulled down at a time.

2310. You object to people having money to find lodgings; should you object to the Board of Works, or whatever authority took down the buildings, finding lodgings for these people?—No, not if they were suitable for them; each one would of course have to know that.

2311. That would be a preferable plan to merely giving these people money, and letting them find lodgings for themselves?—I have known them put a table in one person's room, and a chair in another's, and get on the best way they could until the money was gone, and then put their heads in any hole they could.

Mr. *Cropper.*

2312. Are the landlords of your street small people who own one house, or are they landlords of the street?—As regards Chapel-place, where I was speaking to the gentleman about, there is a deputy of seven houses, two families in each house.

2313. Is it very important for you to live in this quarter?—Yes, my sole subsistence, having a sickly wife, depends upon my labour in that quarter.

2314. Are there shops about there?—There are shops about there in general; I may have a recommendation from one person to the other.

2315. Where are you doing your work of house decorating?—I may extend it to Torrington-square; I work for plenty of people in Keppel-street; then I may be wanted next day in Crown-street, and then down Walpole-street.

2316. So that any house within this circle would suit you as well as Compton-street?—Yes; it would not do to be far away.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2317. You say with regard to Chapel-street, where you used to live, that there was no sanitary accommodation?—No.

2318. And the house was in a very bad state?—Yes; there were no water-closets in the houses at all; they were right at the end of the houses.

2319. Was there no inspection of the houses by the medical officer of the district?—I was there for seven years, and I never saw a medical officer in my place.

2320. And you never saw a medical officer inspecting the houses?—I saw him going once

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

down with the landlord, and he made him put on a waste-preventer, but it was a sort of waste-preventer I would not like to see put on

2321. It was not in your house?—I used to have to use the same water. There are two water-closets at the end of the yard, for the seven houses. We used to get our water from a pump at the other end of the street, against the church; there was a sort of a well sunk there.

2322. And no improvement was made in the state of things during the seven years you were there?—No; I stripped the paper off the walls of one house, and they were ten coats thick. When the walls wanted repapering, they dabbed one piece of paper over the other.

2323. You say that Compton-street, where you live at present, has always been in a bad state?—No.

2324. I understand you to say that it ought to be pulled down?—No; I never mentioned that.

2325. You spoke of Chapel-place?—Yes.

2326. You say, if you went out to the suburbs you would lose your work?—Yes; I might as well go to America as go to the suburbs.

2327. Even if you found a good house there?—A house would be no good to me, I want to keep to my trade.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2328. You work for yourself, as well as for others?—Yes.

2329. You say that, in your opinion, provision ought to be made for the people ousted by demolition?—Yes.

2330. Is that the general opinion of men like yourself?—Yes, I believe it is; it is a regular topic they talk about. They say, what shall we do? I hope they will build places for us to go into, before they turn us out.

2331. Without bordering on anything political, are we to infer from that answer that there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction among intelligent artizans like yourself, that there is no provision made?—Yes, that is their idea; and they say the same as I do—they think it is not the money they require; all the money in the world would not compensate a man who has been ousted from his house and home.

2332. Is the general feeling of men like yourself, to keep the family together?—Quite so.

2333. Then you are opposed to any system, however good it may seem, that would break up a family?—Most decidedly.

2334. If you had good wages, living in the country, and getting up at six o'clock in the morning, and not returning till late at night, you would not consider that any compensation?—I would not be happy any hour of the day.

2335. You would be a money-getting machine, and not the father of a family?—Yes; we can produce men to you who can tell you that from Monday morning to Saturday night they do not see their children who are living in the suburbs.

2336. You do not think that is good?—I do not think it is; the children do not have the care they ought to have.

2337. Does not separation of the bread-winner from the mother and children, tend greatly to bad habits?—It does indeed.

2338. If

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

2338. If a man comes soaked through in the morning, and perishing with cold, is it not a temptation to him to do something to rally the circulation, before he begins his day's work?—Many hundreds now are led away through that, having a drop of rum and milk in the morning, if they get wet.

2339. As to making provision as was proposed under Sir Richard Cross's Act, for a district pulled down, is it the general notion amongst men like yourself that provision might be made gradually, bit by bit, though it could not always be made suddenly?—Yes; that is my idea, and that is the idea of my fellow workmen in general that a block should be made sufficient to hold so many, and then that another block should be made at a little distance from it.

2340. Then perhaps you would agree with me, if I put it in another way; the block being made for so few, not so many; if it is to be made for so many, for such a multitude as in the case of Wild-street, the difficulty is insuperable of putting up sufficient buildings before that multitude is displaced?—Yes.

2341. And if displaced would they ever be got together again?—No; they would not.

2342. Is there not a great means of industry destroyed, when a great population living by each other is broken up and displaced?—It is the ruin of them.

2343. Their trades are ruined, and their industry is extinguished?—Yes.

2344. And their connection with one another, and their reliance upon one another, is broken?—All that reliance and confidence is gone and broken up.

2345. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that in cases of exigency and slack work, humble men who live by the labour of those under them, very much help each other, and prefer to keep each other rather than to see their neighbours pauperised?—Yes, they do; they tell one another of work, and speak for one another for jobs.

2346. But if that connection is broken up and displaced, from the incidents of any demolitions or improvements, will that ever be reproduced in the same place?—No: not that fellow friendship.

2347. Or the same continuity?—No.

2348. If, instead of pulling down a large district, with a view of its replacement, upon a better footing, the demolition were to go step by step, as under Miss Octavia Hill's system, by replacing the houses, house by house, and court by court, would not a great part of the evil be removed?—Yes; a great part.

2349. The labourers would make an effort to provide, say for six months, for an overflow, where the overflow was only a court or an alley, but for a street it is impossible to ask them to do it, when the overflow amounts to scores of houses?—Yes; it is impossible.

2350. Therefore, I understand from you that, without the intelligent artizan class objecting in the least to the town being improved, they object to be the sole sufferers by that improvement?—That is so.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2351. What block of buildings did you speak of when you said that eight out of ten were strangers to the neighbourhood?—Wild-street and Drury-lane.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

2352. That block belongs to the Peabody trustees, does it not?—I believe so.

2353. You spoke of certain new blocks which were built up, inhabited by mostly strangers to the neighbourhood?—Yes.

2354. What were they?—Lincoln-court and Orange-court, Wild-street.

2355. Who built them, the Peabody trustees?—I think so.

2356. Do you know whether any offer was made to the people in the neighbourhood to come into these houses after they were built?—I do not know whether or not any offer was made to them, but before they were up they were very nearly taken.

2357. Do you know that in the East of London an offer was made by the Peabody trustees to house the persons displaced upon the site, and that only 11 accepted it; you are not aware of that?—I am not aware of it, but I think it is the case here. There are a great many strangers; I used to know a great number who used to live in Lincoln-court and Orange-court, being small dealers and market porters, and people who went out with a water-cress basket. I know them from being secretary of the club that they belonged to.

2358. Why is it that they are strangers; is it that the buildings are not suitable?—Those that are occupying it now get up nearer to their work, and they have been living in the suburbs.

2359. The people living in the suburbs come into London?—Yes, and they monopolise the rooms in the Peabody Buildings, to a certain extent, much more than they ought, and we are turned out.

2360. Do you think that the Peabody Buildings would be suitable to the persons who are turned out?—Yes, if they were erected on a different scale, the name they give it frightens them. The name frightens a labourer when he sees "Artizans' Dwellings." He says, that will not suit me; he is afraid to go; there is a sort of intimidation upon them, they think it is too much above their position in life to live there.

2361. Does he not go and inquire and see what they are like?—The man cannot go and inquire; he has to look after his bit of bread; the wife goes and inquires, and she gets a form and fills it up, and there is this form to go through, about vaccination, and the children must not play on the stairs, and you must use the copper on such a day, and the women meet with one and the other, and it ends in a drop of gin, and there is no room got that day; and after you have made out your form, if it is not made exactly to the letter there is the form thrown into the waste paper basket; that has been known. I could give cases of people who have gone through it.

2362. As a matter of fact, the buildings are let as soon as they are put up?—Before they are put up.

2363. That shows that there are a number of people who like them?—Yes; but they are not the poorer classes who are turned out; they cannot hire the Workman's Dwellings.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

2364. Have you made up your mind as to whether any better schemes are necessary. When you take the whole of a street and say the houses are unhealthy and that they ought to be cleared away?—It is very necessary to have some improvement.

2365. But could not the houses be dealt with piece by piece instead of being destroyed altogether?—Yes; most decidedly.

2366. Then it is not that the destruction of the houses is necessary, but that the sanitary condition is bad, and the sanitary condition should be improved?—If the improvement takes place, it is not necessary to pull down all the houses. If you like to pull down one house because it is in a very bad state, the other houses may stand; it is not necessary to pull down the whole of the houses to cure the sanitary principle of a house.

2367. Do you know any areas which have been dealt with under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts; have you seen the houses which have been pulled down before they have been pulled down?—Yes, and have been in them.

2368. Were they such as they might have been improved, and need not have been pulled down?—That is the case in Lincoln-court and Drury-lane; if some of them were not pulled down they would fall down. There are no bannisters to the stairs.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2369. You said that you objected to some of the rules, and to the application for rooms; allow me to read to you, shortly, one form of application. I will go slowly, and perhaps you will tell me what you object to. "Name. Occupation. Weekly wages. Address. Number of rooms wanted. Whether married or single. Number of children residing with parents. Ages of boys. Ages of girls. Whether vaccinated. Whether in receipt of parish relief. Do you agree to abide by the rules. Employer's name and his address." Now do you object to fill that form up?—Yes, to the whole of it. I would object to every particle of it. If you published a bill in your window "First floor to let," and I came and gave you a honest reference, where I had been paying my way at the last house, and you go there and make inquiries, it matters not to you about vaccination and other things. Other people look after that.

2370. You do not mind giving your name?—No, I have to give my name.

2371. It is the vaccination that you object to?—And several other things besides.

2372. This is one of the rules, "Disorderly and intemperate tenants will receive immediate notice to leave." You do not object to that?—I should ask if it was a sober house if I went to live in any house.

2373. You do not seem to be fond of the Peabody Trust?—No.

2374. You never lived in one of them?—No, I was bigoted against it from what other parties told me.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

2375. You must have met curious characters about in this district; you mentioned some lying drunk in the street?—Yes.

2376. They were living in a very bad state; you mentioned Little Chapel-place; that is very bad and very insanitary?—Yes, that is so.

2377. Do you think it wise or not to remove dwellings of that character where the inhabitants' health must suffer; do you think they ought to be left standing?—No, but that is not going to be touched.

2378. No, but I take that as an example?—I speak of Lincoln-court, that has been demolished.

2379. Do you think that that place ought to have been kept up?—No, not kept up, but I speak of compensation; if there were suitable dwellings erected for those people to go into, not compensating them with money, they would naturally have gone in, having no other place to go to.

2380. But you will allow that before you can erect fresh buildings you must clear a certain space?—That is very correct.

2381. Is it not necessary to make approaches and roads?—I maintain that any builder could have erected half the Peabody Buildings which stand in Dury-lane, and have left the teeth in, ready for the other portion of the brickwork, and so have accommodated them, in that way; when you are incommoding people, like that, you must make some provision.

2382. Surely that place was always in a very bad insanitary state; did not the medical officers condemn it all?—Yes, they have been there on several occasions, but I speak of Chapel-place, as regards the sanitary improvement.

2383. I thought you lived there, and said you never saw a medical officer there in your life?—Not Chapel-place, but in Lincoln-court they have been; I never lived in Lincoln-court, I have been there to summons our men belonging to our society.

2384. I gather that you have no objection whatever to these people being moved, if the Metropolitan Board of Works were able to show that they could find them places elsewhere to live in?—Yes, in the vicinity of where they are getting their living; some get their living from their infancy up to old age, in and about the market.

2385. And you think that if the Metropolitan Board of Works was able to say to a family, there is a comfortable house as good as you have now, and you will not have to pay a penny more for it, it would be better, and you would not advocate these people getting any compensation whatever?—None whatever.

2386. Would you not give them something for the trouble of moving their furniture?—No, they would receive compensation in better dwellings, and cleaner ones.

2387. That would satisfy you?—Yes.

2388. And would satisfy the working classes?—Yes.

27 *March* 1882.

The Reverend JOHN ROSE, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2389. Do you live at Lloyd House, Lloyd Square?—Yes.

2390. Will you tell the Committee where your cure is?—Clerkenwell.

2391. Is it the parish church?—Yes.

2392. How long have you been in charge of Clerkenwell?—I have been in charge nearly seven years, and I was curate for seven years before that, so that I have been nearly 14 years at the parish church.

2393. Have you been witness to a good deal of this demolition of houses that has taken place of late years?—Yes.

2394. Could you tell us in general terms what the effect of it has been as to overcrowding?—The effect has been to drive the people who are turned out from these houses that have been pulled down into other streets of the parish, and to overcrowd them, and I may say that we have suffered more in that way from the pulling down in neighbouring parishes than in our own; in St. Lukes and in Holborn a great many houses have been demolished, and the people have come into our parish.

2395. Are you well acquainted with the habits and occupations of the people who live in Clerkenwell?—I have lived amongst them, and worked amongst them every day for 14 years.

2396. We will suppose that there was to be either a great improvement scheme by the Metropolitan Board of Works, or that some part of your parish was condemned under these Acts, and a demolition took place; in your opinion would it be wise or safe to leave the inhabitants to find their own dwellings where they could?—No; I do not think it would be.

2397. Do you think their occupations are such that they require to live near their place of work?—Very many of them, I know, are compelled to live somewhere in the neighbourhood.

2398. What kind of people are they?—We have, of course, some costermongers and a good many market porters, and we have a great many people who work in the watch and jewelry business, who have to go into their shops at certain hours in the morning, and work until late at night.

2399. Would it do to allow some of them to go out if you could find suitable accommodation for them?—I think it is a great evil to separate a family at all, but there are a good many who could go out, and a good many who do go out.

2400. But you think it advisable that the head of the family should not be separated for the whole of the day from his family?—I think so.

2401. But some of the families might go to the suburbs, and find work there, and stay there altogether?—Possibly they might.

2402. But some certainly not?—Certainly not.

2403 Have the rents risen in your district since the demolition has taken place?—I should say the rents have risen 50 per cent. within the last 10 years.

Mr. *Cropper.*

2404. Have you ever been curate or clergyman in a country place?—Yes, I have.

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

2405. Have you found that the country labourers have to take their food and go out a distance to their work?—Not to any very great distance.

2406. Do they come home to their meals?—Generally; it was considered a misfortune if they could not do it.

2407. Then in the place where you have been chiefly engaged in London, you find the people do come home to their meals?—Yes

2408. And they live so near their work that they can do it?—A good many of them do.

2409. And they find it a great advantage?—Yes.

2410. Then your experience is that the people who live in your district have work in the district?—In the district, or in the City, which is close by us.

Sir *Matthew Ridley.*

2411. Have you had any street improvements carried out, any large pulling down of property under the Artizans' Dwellings Act or other Acts, in your district?—No; our pulling down has been for making the new road from east to west.

2412. That involved the destruction of a certain number of houses?—Yes.

2413. Were those very bad houses?—Some were very bad indeed.

2414. In that case, what became of the population; did they get crowded into the remaining portion?—They get crowded into the streets; where we used to have a man carrying on his business and living with his family, he now simply has his workshop, and lets out the remaining rooms, and his family and himself go out into the suburbs.

2415. Did the pulling down of these houses destroy any trades at all; did it remove any businesses?—No, I do not think it removed any businesses.

2416. To your knowledge, has any parishioner with whom you are acquainted, tried living outside and coming into their work every day?—I do not know many who have tried it; the people that suffer the most severely are those who cannot afford to go out; we have many who do not earn above 1 *l.* per week, and they could not possibly afford to go outside.

2417. Would not the difference of house rent between the outside of London and the crowded streets of Clerkenwell, be amply sufficient for coming in by train or tram?—It possibly would, but there are other things to be considered besides. Where a man has small wages his wife can earn something to supplement his wages, and going out into the suburbs would break up the connection, and she cannot get any work outside.

2418. That would be an additional objection to the objection you feel to a man being taken from his meals with his family in the middle of the day?—Yes.

2419. Then upon the ground of health, you say you have no experience of these men going out into the country; you could not speak to that?—No, I could not speak to that.

Sir *Matthew Ridley*—continued.

2420. Would there not be some saving in the doctor's bill?—Clerkenwell is quite as healthy as the suburban parishes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2421. Do you think the evils of overcrowding are solely those of ill health, or physical debasements; do you think there are other evils connected with overerowding?—Certainly.

2422. What are they?—It is hardly possible for people to live decently, as they are crowded together now, in some parts of the parish.

2423. There they bring up their children?—Yes, they bring up a large family living in one or two rooms.

2424. Have you observed that that demoralisation has its effect upon the industrial capaeity of the bread winner to maintain himself; does it deteriorate his industrial abilities when the family become demoralised and debased in that way?—Of eourse it does.

2425. Does it tend to habits of inebriety?—I think very often a working man goes to a public-house because he has not a decent home to stop in.

2426. Have you found difficulty in your pastoral words in admonishing and directing the people, on account of the overcrowding and debased eondition of their homes?—I have found it very difficult to induce them to make any improvement in their living; you hardly know what to tell them when a man and his wife and two or three children live in one room, such as I took you to when you eame over to the district; it is impossible for people to live deeently at all.

2427. When you and I went over the distriet for the purpose of laying certain statements before Parliament, we found there was a great migration of foreign population into Clerkenwell?—We have had the Italian colony driven into us from Hare-street Hill, and that part of Holborn.

2428. They are chiefly single youths or men?—Chiefly people going about with ice barrows, and organs, and those sort of things.

2429. What happens when they take refuge in Clerkenwell; do they live together in exeessive numbers?—Often times a very large number of them oecupy two or three rooms and they seem to live in common; they are out the greater part of the day, from very early morning in the summer time, following their avocations, and they spend very few hours in their homes, or else I do not think they could possibly live.

2430. The chief trade in Clerkenwell is the watch and jewelry trade, is it not?—Yes.

2431. That is chiefly a trade done by working people in their own houses?—To a large extent, but a great many masters employ several men on their own premises; they have workshops at the baeks of their houses.

2432. But the fitters and finishers, and many other branches of the trade, do work at home?—Yes.

2433. And they go for the materials of their work to the master, and return to their own homes, and finish it, and then they go baek with it?—Yes.

2434. Is that a trade which from your obser-

Mr. *Torrens*—continud.

vation could be earried on successfully, if the people were dispersed into distant regions?—I think the men employed in that business could live as well outside as in the parish.

2435. Do you think that they would go?—I think they would, and many do.

2436. Where do they go to?—They live all round London.

2437. Up to Holloway?—Yes.

2438. Their hours are not precise, they can come when they like?—They must do their work, but they work what hours they like.

2439. Can you suggest any provision that would facilitate those who ean live out of town being able to do so at a moderate cost for travelling to and fro?—I eannot make any suggestion.

2440. Is there any railway that eomes near enough to Clerkenwell to be of use?—The Great Northern runs to King's Cross.

2441. That is the only one?—That is the only one that comes close by; the Metropolitan line runs into the heart of the parish; there is a station at Farringdon-street.

2442. That takes you to the other parts of the town?—Yes, the Great Northern runs to Farringdon-street.

2443. Are there any workmen's trains on the same prineiple as that of the Great Eastern line, promoted or maintained by the Great Northern Company?—I do not know that there are.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2444. Do you connect the rise of rents with the demolitions that have taken place in the neighbourhood?—I think so; the population of London increases, or at any rate the increased population increases the rent.

2445. It is not solely due to these demolitions?—No.

2446. To some extent it has been met by some of the workmen going out into the suburbs?—Yes.

2447. Has any counter movement taken place; have they started from the country and eome to live in the neighbourhood?—I do not know that they have come from the country, but they have come from the parishes round about.

2448. But you do not know of cases of men who tried living in the country coming back to live in town?—No, I do not.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2449. Did I gather from you that you objected to this improvement that was made in Clerkenwell?—No, I do not object to that improvement, but I object to the people being turned out and having no place to go to.

2450. You have been 14 years, I think, giving spiritual administration, have you not?—Yes.

2451. In the course of that time did you ever visit a place, in days gone by, called Frying Pan-alley?—Yes.

2452. You know what it was called, it was called Little Hell?—Yes.

2453. I believe it being called Little Hell, it was very much of that character, was it not?—It was a very bad place indeed.

2454. Referring to Bit-alley, Frying Pan-alley, and Rose-alley, do you think it is a wise thing for the people to be left there in that state, or

to

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued

to remove them elsewhere?—Remove them elsewhere, certainly.

2455. Instead of being left crowding round about you, is it not much better that these poor people should go into the country where they will get more room and fresh air than they could get crowded together in places like this?—The class of people who lived in Bit-alley and Frying Pan-alley were for the most part costermongers, and I do not see how they could live in the country, and follow their avocations and get a living; and hence they would not move out, but come and overcrowd us, and we are already full enough.

2456. But surely there are inspectors of nuisances and officers appointed by the vestry to see that the houses are not overcrowded?—We have houses that were built for one family; an eight roomed house, that was built for one family, will now have as many as six or seven families living in it without anything that will attract the inspector's notice or attention; it is clear that it cannot be a good place for all these people to live in, and if they go on for a certain time living in it, you will have to repeat the same process in these streets as you have in Bit-alley and Frying Pan-alley, and clear them away too.

2457. You said a good number of people who were displaced could just as well live in the country as in the neighbourhood round about you as far as their trade went?—Many of those engaged in the watch trade could.

2458. You were asked about trams; there is a tramway in Clerkenwell taking people very conveniently away?—The Angel is close by, and the trams run in all directions from there.

2459. That being the case they could come in to their work, and go out into the country in every direction?—There is no question about the communication at all, but people who only earn low wages, like 1 *l.* a week, break up their old associations and they cannot get helped by their wives getting work, and practically they find it is not simply the question of rent and tramway fares, but they lose so much in other directions,

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

that they cannot live out in the suburbs, and they do not.

2460. Do you find that they go into the Peabody and other industrial dwellings?—The industrial dwellings are always filled in our parish; we have not any Peabody Buildings, but we are going to have some erected on Pear Tree-court.

2461. They are dwellings of the same character, are they not?—They are always looking out for rooms, they have their names a long while on the books before they can get in.

2462. Have you heard any objections made as to the regulations?—Not by those living in them; people make objections when they read the rules, but I always find that those in the dwellings themselves are perfectly content.

Chairman.

2463. And probably they are very glad of them?—Yes, they are very glad to have a place kept cleanly.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2464. Then, practically, some of the people who are dispossessed go into the Industrial Dwellings, and others finding they are able to go by the tramways find dwellings out in the suburbs?—The only objection to the Industrial Dwellings at the present time is, that the rents are so very high that men who have families and small wages cannot afford to go into them.

2465. A working man living in Lichfield-street gave evidence that he paid 8 *s.* 6 *d.* for two rooms; do you not think that he would make a very good change from paying 8 *s.* 6 *d.* to paying 3 *s.* or 4 *s.* to the Industrial Dwellings Company?—He would; but if a man who has a family goes into the Industrial Dwellings, they will compel him to have a certain number of rooms; they will not take a man with seven children into one or two rooms, and the more rooms he has the higher the rent he has to pay. It is better for him that he should have the rooms, but a man with 1 *l.* or 25 *s.* a week cannot afford to pay so much.

Thursday, 30th March 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Viscount Emlyn.
Mr. Hastings.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Holloud.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. THOMAS ECKFORD POWELL, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2466. WHAT are you?—A book-binder; I represent the Machine Rulers' Society (Bookbinders' and Machine Rulers' Consolidated Union, London Branch) as well.

2467. Where do you live?—18, Raymouth-road, Jamaica Level, S.E.

2468. How long have you lived there?—For 12 years.

2469. For whom do you work; do you work for yourself, or for some firm?—It may be right to state that I have left the trade for the last five years. I used to work in Westminster, for Mr. Bedford.

2470. What kind of a house do you live in at the present moment?—The rental is 12 *s.* a week.

2471. How many rooms do you get for that?—Seven rooms and a scullery. I desire to make a statement in behalf of the Trades Council.

2472. Just answer a few questions first. What we want to know is whether you think, when any number of these houses where the artizans and labourers at present live, are pulled down under Improvement Acts, or under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, it is necessary that houses should be provided, to a certain extent, for the working men, or whether it would do to let them go out into the suburbs and find houses for themselves?—I think that houses should be provided to the fullest extent.

2473. Will you tell us why?—Because I think that the inconvenience is very great to the workmen; they go to the suburbs frequently, sometimes from choice, and sometimes from compulsion.

2474. Will they not get better rooms in the suburbs?—They may sometimes, but frequently the inconvenience more than counterbalances what advantage may arise.

2475. What kind of inconvenience?—Distance from their employment.

2476. Cannot they get out by the workmen's trains?—They can sometimes, but not always.

2477. Did you ever live in the suburbs yourself?—No.

2478. Do you know any men who do?—I have had occasion to use workmen's trains, but not from the suburbs.

Chairman—continued.

2479. Do you know any of your companions who live in the suburbs?—Yes.

2480. What account do they give of it?—The trains are inconvenient in time to suit many; they only suit a few.

2481. Some of the people who are displaced might safely go out to the suburbs?—They might.

2482. And some could not?—Some would rather not.

2483. Have you ever lived in any model lodging-houses?—Never.

2484. I suppose some of your friends have?—Yes.

2485. What account do they give of them?—Somewhat various.

2486. Have they any complaints to make?—Several.

2487. What kind of complaints do they make?—As the answers to these questions are embodied in a statement which I have, I should prefer to read the statement, if it is the same thing, to the Committee.

2488. You have a statement which you wish to make to the Committee?—Yes, I will tell you why I prefer to make the statement as a representative of the London Trades' Council. The London Trades' Council, for the purpose of placing the best information they could procure before the Committee, elected a special committee of their own to collect the opinions of their fellow-workmen, together with their own experience, and condense them in a form that might meet with your acceptance; we thought it might save time and misunderstanding if this condensed opinion of the Council were read to you.

2489. How many trades are represented in the Council?—Sixty-eight.

2490. What are the trades?—I will hand in a list. (*The same was handed in.*)

2491. Will you be good enough to read the statement?—"Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875. A glance through this

Chairman—continued.

this Act makes it impossible to believe that its spirit and intention are otherwise than good, and its provisions and conditions appear to be laid down with sufficient clearness and precision to be understood, by those at least who have any desire to work in accordance with its spirit. But except upon an assumption that its provisions have been innocently, or wilfully, misunderstood, it would be difficult to find the causes, or the reasons which have combined to stultify its beneficial operation. The destruction of dwellings which are unfit for human habitation, or the complete removal of the conditions which render them so unfit, and the erection of healthy and suitable dwellings in their stead, are its prevailing and ruling principles, but the important question of "unfitness" would certainly appear to be liable to extreme elasticity of opinion, and would appear to vary in different areas, in some measure, with the different influences at work. Again, sanitary conditions and arrangements are constantly infringed, and the vital elements of light and air, and ventilation, are, for questionable reasons, but lightly regarded in many existing houses which might not be deemed unfit for human habitation. But the condemnation of existing houses necessarily opens up the next important question of how best to provide suitable and healthy dwellings in their stead, and this problem is recognised as more difficult of solution than appeared at first sight. The block system of dwellings has not yet found favour with the great bulk of the working classes of London. A strong feeling of disappointment with most of the earlier examples, and of dislike to what has been called the barrack-like publicity or gregariousness of the system, and their barrack-like external appearance, has in wide measure developed into a deep and settled prejudice, which has certainly not been without various and ample ground for its justification. The bare unplastered walls, the contracted rooms and windows, the painful monotony of the endless whitewash, unrelieved by even the most distant pretence of ornament, or of anything whatever to please the eye or mind, the cold, cheerless, uninviting appearance of the approaches and staircases, together with the sense of irksome restraint through the conditions and regulations imposed in some of those early examples of the system, have assisted largely to engender this feeling of hostility, and this prejudice, which only a more enlightened and more appreciative policy and practice can hope to eradicate. The individual mechanic cannot be, and will not be, regarded as an unit of a regiment, or of an army, in so far at least as his home life is concerned; his individual taste and desires must ever form important elements and factors in every scheme which seeks to elevate and improve, and to be of lasting benefit to his class, and to the nation; of which the industrial classes form an exceedingly important proportion. The disappointment has been intensified when it has been found that after much parade, and great promise of relief to overcrowded and over-rented multitudes, driven from their homes for all manner of public and private reasons, and compelled to seek and find other homes

Chairman—continued.

at enhanced prices, the promised land has offered no relief at all except at still further enhanced rentals. It is quite true that endeavours have been made more recently, and with great success, to meet and to overcome the main causes of the existing dislike and prejudice against the system. The Dover Buildings, Old Kent-road; the Huntingdon Buildings, Bethnal Green-road; the Darwin Buildings, and several blocks raised by the Industrial Dwellings Company, are probably amongst the most recent and best examples of how taste and convenience, and privacy of home, may be secured in the block system, in perhaps even greater degree than in the ordinary dwellings of the industrial classes. The same may be said of the large and imposing block of buildings now in course of construction on the site of the old Queen's Bench Prison; but this latter example may serve as an illustration of how an otherwise handsome and desirable system of dwellings may be needlessly rendered uninviting by cheerless and repellent approaches (staircases); while the light and airy staircases of the Huntingdon Buildings stand in marked and favourable contrast with the dark and cheerless staircases of the Victoria Buildings, Paul-street. But the one apparently insurmountable objection governs them all in greater or less degree. It is little use of the ordinary artizan or labourer, or of the poor clerk, looking with longing eyes at the superior domestic advantages of some of these systems of dwellings professedly erected for his use, if these advantages are placed beyond the reach of his purse. Regarding the block dwellings system as an unavoidable necessity in the centres of industry in London, yet capable of being made very welcome to the working classes, it is essential that certain main conditions should be kept steadily in view. Generally speaking, convenient sites have been sought and found, but future blocks should be built in, or as near as possible to, centres of industry; on, or as near as possible to, those sites, of which large numbers of the industrial classes have been dispossessed by public works or improvements, and let at prices bearing a much gentler proportion to the earnings of intended occupiers than the artificial, forced-up, high-pressure prices at present existing in London. The proportion which the rent paid by the working classes of London bears to their earnings is 20 per cent., calculating upon constant employment; when employment fails and earnings are curtailed, as is the case with tens of thousands of the working classes year by year, the per-centage is of course largely increased. The rents demanded in the present block buildings, with the exception of the dwellings raised by the Peabody Trustees, which approximate much more closely to an equitable standard of proportion, would represent a proportion of 25 to 28 per cent. of earnings calculated on the basis of constant employment. It would appear a necessity that the State should acquire, compulsorily if necessary, land for the purposes of this Act. Strict care should be taken to exclude anything in the shape of fancy prices, the market value only being allowed, as though the land were not at all specially required. The greatest dispatch should be used in the clearing of the sites and construction of dwell-

Chairman—continued.

ings, so that recuperation should follow as rapidly as possible. It has been observed that on property raised by Industrial Dwellings' Companies the rateable value has enormously increased. It may reasonably be argued that upon land acquired for the purposes herein indicated, the rateable value of the property created for these purposes ought never to be in excess of the rateable value of the property demolished. The want of good and cheap accommodation for the very poor is an evil of great magnitude, and cries aloud for remedy. Thousands of poor women, and men too, of the hawker or small costermonger class, with and without young children, and earning not more than 10*s.* weekly, are compelled to pay 2*s.* 6*d.*, 3*s.*, or 3*s.* 6*d.* for single rooms of the most miserable description, or otherwise take refuge in cheap low lodging-houses, where inevitable contact with the dissolute and the vile surely and rapidly saps whatever degree of self-respect or respect for others previously existed. Mistakes in sanitary arrangements cause discomfort wherever they exist, but in the block system the evils attendant upon an error in principle or construction are intensified; and presumably experienced architects and sanitary engineers are occasionally guilty of errors which the veriest tyro might condemn at first sight. Dust-shafts are sometimes constructed with the traps opening in the kitchens where the families chiefly live, and through each fault in the fitting or closing of the vertical cover of the opening issues a cloud of dust on every occasion the dwellers above send their quota flying down the shaft. Others, again, with the openings on the stairs or corridors, badly fitted with wooden vertical slides, cover the stairs and corridors with a constant deposit of dust. These are faults easily remedied; and probably amongst the best in practical operation are those which we have seen in the Peabody Buildings in Southwark-street and Blackfriars-road. More serious consequences frequently occur through errors in the construction or design, or through the culpable negligence of those in charge of the construction of drains and waste pipes; and a small community may have to undergo slow poisoning for many months before a manifest and patent blunder, which the most elementary knowledge of sanitary science should have rendered impossible, can be remedied. The bedrooms generally are too small, 11 feet by 7½ feet being apparently considered sufficient space for sleeping accommodation in some large blocks, while a commodious kitchen does not yet appear to be recognised as a desideratum for families blessed with a prominent proportion of smaller branches. The great height, also, to which some of the buildings are carried is in itself an objection. It is a feature which tells severely upon the strength of those who are induced to occupy the highest floors by their comparatively low rents. They should be assimilated as nearly as possible in this respect to the ordinary house, and the nearer they approach the requirements here indicated, preserving the best features of the best present examples, the sooner will they find favour with the classes for whom they were intended. No permanent benefit, no benefit worthy of the name, can, however, be conferred,

Chairman—continued.

if advantage should be taken of the fact that they will rapidly fill, and rents raised upon the assumption that because the demand is greater than the supply the letting value should legitimately be raised. This should be taken as an indication only that increased supply is urgently needed, *if* benefit to the industrial classes in the shape of better and cheaper house accommodation is the object intended to be kept in view. The only restrictions which should be imposed, or which could be tolerated, should be strict sanitary regulations; these should in all cases be enforced. In the endeavour to find suitable accommodation for the ever-increasing numbers of the working-classes, driven more and more away from their industrial centres by public and commercial enterprises, and too often without any further recognition of their rights, or wants, or necessities, than a grim and arbitrary raising of their rent implies, the suggestion that houses should be built on an extensive scale in the suburbs has in very many quarters found ready acceptance; and there can hardly be a doubt that a system of cottage homes substantially built, providing adequate and good accommodation, convenient to railway lines or other cheap conveyance, and at a rental compensating for the cost of travelling, extra cost of living, and inconvenience to the workman, resulting from distance from employment, would be a desirable scheme, and, providing an equitable system of purchase could be engrafted on the terms of tenancy, would be a preferable alternative. An equitable system of purchase should be simple and easy, and should include a simple and just arrangement whereby a person, having already become part proprietor of the house he occupies, should, in times of depression and failure of wages, be enabled to rest without payment of rent, or with partial payment of rent for any necessary length of time, governed by the value of his share in the ownership. Much may be said about leaving these matters to the legitimate efforts of private enterprise, but experience has shown that the health of the people cannot safely be longer left to the tender mercies of speculative jerry-builders and greedy rack-renting house-farmers; and laudable, and necessary, and worthy of support as private enterprise undoubtedly is, it is more than time that something were done to check *that* kind of enterprise which gives to the people coffin-homes, dooms its victims to lives of pain and broken health, fills the dispensaries and hospitals with endless cases of chest disease, compels grave-diggers to work overtime, and enhances the value of burial grounds on the plea of inordinate demand. The health of the people is at least of equal importance to the education of the people. The State has undertaken the care of the health of the mind and intellect of the people, and is using the very best and the most incorruptible means at its disposal to effect that end. The physical health of the people is the physical health, and strength, and wealth of the nation, and the State should do something more effectual than hitherto to ensure that a healthy mind shall inhabit a healthy body." There are some details which my friend Mr. Abrey will be better able to supply you with than I am.

2492. You

Chairman—continued.

2492. You talk of the extra cost of living in the suburbs; what do you mean by that?—The distance from the central markets and from the ordinary market places, unquestionably raises the price of almost every commodity in the small suburban districts.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2493. On behalf of the 68 trades, I want to know the way you think we ought to build cottage homes?—By the State or by private enterprize. We have shadowed out a scheme here; it is immaterial who takes the matter in hand first, or so long as the State makes necessary provision to arrange for the favourable transfer or acquisition of the land, and takes care that the rents shall not be arbitrarily raised.

2494. Do I understand you to think that the State should purchase property, either in London or outside of London, for one class of the community and take care that their rents are lower than they ought to be, according to the usual scale of ents, for the express purpose of benefiting one class of the community?—We think if any public works are authorised by which the dwellings of the poor are destroyed, the State is morally bound to provide others rather at cheaper, than at enhanced prices.

2495. Do you think they ought to get them at a price less than the market price?—It depends upon what the market price is; the market price is now artificial.

2496. Then you do think it ought to be less than the market price?—Less than the present market price. Our contention is that the market price has been raised through the demolition of houses.

2497. You said that you thought the sites ought to be cleared quicker; how is that to be accomplished?—We say that no delay should occur in the clearing of sites, and the construction of dwellings.

2498. As far as you know, you have no reason to say that in any of these artizans' schemes in London there has been delay?—It is idle to say that we have not heard of cases where the sites have been too long cleared.

2499. I suppose you know that it is necessary in taking possession of other people's property, to go into inquiries about all the land, and to see what the claims are and compensate them properly?—Unquestionably.

2500. If law takes a certain time, you have no objection to it, if carried out in a proper way?—Sometimes the law takes too long.

2501. We agree in that, but if the law exists in this way, we must act according to law?—Alter the law, but until the law is altered, of course you must do so.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2502. If you buy sites, and built houses upon them, and sold them below the market value, the loss between what you pay for the site, and what you sold it for, must fall upon the ratepayers, of whom the working classes are the greatest number?—I will answer that question by an actual illustration. We have cited the rents of the Peabody Buildings as approaching nearer a more equitable proportion to the earnings than any other buildings at present existing. If

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

nothing can be done to make the rentals of the other buildings approximate the more equitable proportion, we may regard the question of improved dwellings for the poor as completely hopeless; if the same conditions are to exist always that have existed, that question is perfectly hopeless.

2503. But the Peabody Trust is, of course, a charity?—It may be so; then the State must provide something else, when they demolish people's homes.

2504. Supposing you had a State charity, the loss must fall upon the ratepayers, and the working classes are those who would feel it first, being the most numerous class?—It would be generally spread; the ratepayers benefit as a whole generally by the demolition of houses. Regarding as I do, the re-constructing of dwellings as a moral obligation and an act of restitution, I cannot regard it as a charity at all.

2505. But the actual loss is increased considerably; the loss that falls upon the ratepayers is increased very largely in consequence. If you clear a very expensive site in the city, and use that site for comparatively non-remunerative purposes, like that of building artizans' dwellings, a heavy loss falls upon the ratepayers of the city?—One of the very greatest parts of the objection is to fancy prices being charged, and compensations paid which were not just or due, and which ought not to have been paid; and the difficulties on the part of benevolent and philanthropic gentlemen who have started the schemes, have been greatly enhanced by the fancy prices.

2506. No evidence has been before us, showing that the loss can be largly reduced; in some cases the expense may be reduced to some extent, but nothing like what would be sufficient to compensate the loss?—We are aware if you take the market price as at present existing to be the true market price, then the loss must fall somewhere, but we say, that inasmuch as the houses of the working classes have been demolished for the benefit of the ratepayers, the ratepayers must bear part of the cost, whoever they may be.

2507. You have another scheme, for cottage homes; of course, you contemplate those homes being in the country?—In the suburbs.

2508. How far in your view would the suburbs extend?—Any distance within 10 or 12 miles of Charing Cross, or of any given centre.

2509. For that purpose it would be necessary to have a system of workmen's trains?—Yes.

2510. But you think, I suppose, that there are a sufficient number of workmen amongst the working classes, who could live out in the suburbs, if there were convenient workmen's trains?—If everything was made more convenient then a larger number would go.

2511. And it would be an immense advantage to the working classes themselves?—In some respects it would be an advantage, but it is not all an advantage.

2512. But you think as it is impossible that the whole mass of the working classes should be able to live in London, that it is a necessary part of the scheme that they should go into the country?—A necessary aid.

2513. Then, in your view, what is most necessary for their purpose is convenience of trains?—That is one of the principal features; and one point

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

has been forgotten in the question of trains. It has appeared hitherto that no one is regarded as a working man unless he starts to his employment at five or six o'clock in the morning; that is as huge a mistake as ever was made. The bulk of the working men in London begin their work between six o'clock in the morning and nine. It is only the building trades and some of the out-door trades that begin as early as five or six o'clock in the morning; the greater bulk of the legitimate working men begin work between six o'clock and nine, and no provision is made for them.

2514. You think the workmen's trains should at least begin at five o'clock?—Yes.

2515. And what time should they go back?—Any time after five o'clock in the afternoon, and up to eight o'clock, and they should not cost more than 1*s.* a week.

Mr. *Rankin.*

2516. You spoke of some of the artizans who went by choice, when their houses were demolished, into the suburbs; can you tell me what choice you had in your mind?—The choice is a very mixed one in this regard; some may go by choice without their houses being demolished.

2517. You think that a certain number may go without their houses being demolished; what proportion should you say that would be?—It is impossible to give the proportion.

2518. Would it be one-half?—No, I should say that half of them do not go. Under altered conditions, half might go; in fact, a long way from half.

2519. Have you any knowledge as to the improvement or otherwise of the health of those who have gone?—Some have said so and others have not. Some have got into badly-built, and badly-drained, and badly-ventilated houses, and they have gone to worse instead of better; others have been able to pay a higher rent and got better houses, and they tell me they are well pleased.

2520. Do you know any who, having gone and resided out in the suburbs, have returned by choice to town?—I do.

2521. Are there many instances?—Not comparatively many. There are not many that I know altogether, but out of those that I have known about half have returned.

2522. Chiefly owing to what cause?—Chiefly owing to the inconvenience of being away from their work, and the inconvenience to their wives for marketing, and so forth.

2523. Is it owing to the expense?—The inconvenience has been largely felt that the time occupied travelling to and fro cuts deeply into the time of the day.

2524. Do you think, from your knowledge of the circumstances, that most working men would like to be the owners of their own homes?—Most steady men certainly would.

2525. Do any of your companions in trade join societies such as the Star Bowkett Society, enabling a man to buy his house out and out?—Yes, many do; but these societies are too slow in their operation to commend themselves to every one.

2526. Has your trades council any scheme at all by which artizans and labourers could become owners of their houses?—I cannot say that they have.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

2527. But would such a scheme be met with favour?—Unquestionably it would.

2528. You spoke of 20 per cent. being the proportion of the payment in rent to the income of the labourers and artizans?—Yes.

2529. Perhaps you are not aware that that is the usual proportion in London, throughout all grades of society?—It may be so; it is too high in some instances, and it is very easily paid in others. A man with 10,000 *l.* a-year can pay 2,000 *l.*, and a man with 2,000 *l.* a-year can pay 400 *l.* a-year with the greatest comfort, and leave plenty to live on; but a man with 20 *s.* a week cannot so easily pay 4 *s.*

2530. You also spoke of the unemployed at the present time; can you tell me whether there are a great number of unemployed artizans and labourers in London at the present time?—There are not so many at the present time as I have seen; there is still a great dearth of employment, but it is more amongst the unskilled class.

2531. Are there more labourers and artizans in the country than are necessary for the employment likely to arise?—I think there are more than are necessary for any employment than has yet arisen; there are more than are actually needed.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2532. Has that increase in the supply in the labour market arisen perceptibly from the indraft from the country?—I have talked of a dearth of employment from year to year.

2533. Does the dearth of employment increase from year to year?—There are times of depression; at other times there is very little dearth.

2534. Is the dearth that does arise perceptibly owing in any degree to the indrafts from the country?—No, that is not the main cause.

2535. Does it add to it perceptibly?—It does add to it, but not that I have noticed in any particular degree; times of depression result from commercial depression.

2536. When you speak of the State providing the better habitations for those whom it dispossessed, I presume you mean dwellings generally?—We are dealing at present with artizans' and labourers' dwellings.

2537. I want you to explain what you mean by the liability consequent upon demolition; when you say the State, you mean, I presume, that when works for improvement for the whole town are made by a large authority such as the Metropolitan Board of Works, the whole town should be made to contribute towards the reparation and compensation to the people dispossessed?—You may confine it within the town; I take a larger view of it, the same as many other questions of public policy are taken. Some questions of rates are confined within the limits of the borough, and others are levied imperially. I should prefer to regard it as an imperial question.

2538. The difference is this, that the State generally, it may be argued, does not benefit perceptibly from the improved dwellings, but the whole of the town in which the dwellings are erected

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

erected does benefit?—My opinion is that wherever a town within a state is benefited, the state itself is benefited.

2539. Then you transfer the charge from the locality to the State?—I cannot say that I intend to make a vital point of it; it is perfectly immaterial to me. Whichever in the opinion of the Committee would be the best would be accepted by us; my own opinion is, that it is an imperial question, and a question of State policy.

2540. And you anticipate that the burden would not be very great all round?—It would be lighter all round.

2541. Whereas if the burden fell where hitherto it has been made to fall, in every case and by every Act of Parliament, that is, upon the locality, it is a perceptible burden?—It is unfair to make it fall upon the locality.

Viscount *Emlyn.*

2542. You spoke of the degrees of unfitness of the various areas that have been cleared; are there any areas which have been cleared which you think have been improperly cleared?—That observation is based chiefly upon what I have seen of some of the areas that in my opinion should have been cleared, while they stood existing for years a danger to the dwellers and to all around.

2543. I gather that you think there are more areas in London that ought to have been cleared?—I have seen some that certainly, if the task rested with me, I would clear instantly.

2544. Your remark did not apply to areas which you thought improperly cleared?—No.

2545. You said that the artizans and labourers had been driven from their homes, for all manner of public and private reasons; do you refer to any particular district?—No, I refer to the general question; I do not refer to any particular areas.

2546. May I ask for what private reasons these people have been driven from their homes?—Sometimes companies obtain powers to clear areas and demolish houses.

2547. I gather from you that no areas have been so cleared but those it was necessary to clear?—I cannot give a decided opinion upon that; I have not the special knowledge.

2548. You do not refer to any particular areas?—No, but judging from what I have seen of areas at present existing, I should think the decision was slow of being arrived at that they were unfit for human habitation.

Mr. *Hastings.*

2549. I understood you to say that you desired that this work of new dwellings for the working classes should be carried out by the State; is that so?—They should be assisted in some degree; I have not said that they should be carried out by the State.

2550. You represent a very important body, and I am anxious to understand what their views are upon the matter. I understood you also to say (and I ask you more particularly upon that point) that you thought that any system that was carried out should prevent the raising of rents?—Arbitrarily, simply for the reason that they were much in demand; we hold that to be the reason for building more.

Mr. *Hastings*—continued.

2551. What I am anxious to know is as to the mode of procedure that you wish to see adopted. Do you mean that the State, after it has cleared the ground and put up the buildings, should own the buildings?—No; the intention of the requirement in that address is more that the State should assist those who take the matter in hand; whether it is a public company or a philanthropic company that takes it up, or the Peabody Trust, the State should assist them by enabling them easily to acquire the land, which would be a safeguard against raising the rates, so as ultimately to enhance the rents.

2552. Then you would still allow the houses to be in the hands of private enterprise?—I should be quite willing to do so, so long as they managed the job thoroughly. But what I wish the Committee to see is, that if the same conditions exist as heretofore, the question of better and cheaper houses may as well be given up as hopeless.

2553. How is that to be done; supposing they are left in the hands of private enterprise, how would you prevent the raising of the rents?—I think it could be done by the gentlemen who have done these things before. The State has done such things in its history before. We have examples now how the rents are prevented from being raised, and how they have been forcibly reduced. I do not want to enter upon that subject.

2554. I want to know how far you do wish to see the interference of the State in this matter?—I think the workmen require protection.

2555. Do I understand that you would have any system of management of these buildings on the part of the State?—I should certainly advise supervision of some kind.

2556. I largely agree with you; but I want to know in what way you propose to carry out any system of supervision over buildings?—If they were leased by a private company, and the matters of conveyancing and the purchase of land, and so forth, made easy for them by some special enactment, or under an Act which dealt with the acquiring of land, then the company could have their own superintendent upon the buildings, who would take care of the sanitary arrangements of the dwellings; that, I think, is a very desirable feature.

2557. I am glad to hear you speak so strongly upon the subject of sanitary supervision; is it your experience that working men do desire that, by some extraneous means, their houses should be kept healthy?—So long as their individual liberty is not interfered with, they are perfectly willing to see supervision exercised so that their dwellings shall be kept clean and tidy.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

2558. I rather understand you, from the last answer that you gave, to express a wish that certain interference should take place by the State with regard to the houses; in fact, that landlords should be compelled to put the houses in better order?—Yes, a better system of surveying ought certainly to be in existence than there now is. I

Mr. *Broderick*—continued.

think that part of the surveyor's work, as at present existing, appears to be a farce, or else many of the houses at present existing could not be in existence.

2559. You made one suggestion which I want to ask a question about, that where property had been taken over by one of these building companies, and dwellings erected, the rating of that property should not exceed the rating of it before the buildings were erected?—That is simply given with a desire to try and find some method of assisting us out of the problem ; something must be devised, and that is only a suggestion.

2560. You suggest that the difference between the rates should be put to the reduction of the rent between the old rate and the new rent?—That inasmuch as so much rate was collected upon the old property, it cannot impoverish the borough or parish if they receive the same rate as they have hitherto done ; but, instead of that, they double or treble, and even quadruple, the rating value of the new property, consequently they are the greatest gainers by benevolent or philanthropic schemes ; they could not lose by sticking to the old rates, and they have no right to gain, in our opinion, upon a movement set on foot for this purpose.

Mr. *Bryce.*

2561. You suggest that 1 *s.* a week is the proper charge for workmen's trains ; that would be 1 *d.* a journey, would it not?—Yes.

2562. Is the difference between rents in the suburbs and rents in town not greater than 1 *s.* a week?—In some cases it is.

2563. In most cases, is it not so?—It depends in what part of the suburbs it is.

2564. What part of the suburbs were you thinking of when you suggested 1 *s.* per week?—I suggest 1 *s.* a week as an all-round scheme, which would meet the approbation of the dwellers, and of the railway companies.

2565. Were you thinking of a uniform fare?—Yes, any distance within 10 or 12 miles at a uniform fare ; my opinion is that it would pay the railway companies.

2566. But in most places, towards the end of the 12-miles radius, the difference between the rents in the centre of London and the rents there would be much greater than 1 *s.* per week?—Possibly ; but we must accept a basis. It is further to take a letter to Newcastle than to Finsbury, but it costs 1 *d.* in each case.

2567. Have you considered how much would be necessary to induce a workman to go into the suburbs ; they could afford in many cases to pay

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

more than 1 *s.* per week for railway fares, if they got homes so much cheaper?—Sometimes they might be able to pay it, but we look at the inducements and the benefits; if you make it the maximum you prevent those who most require it going at all. Some pay 2 *s.* a week now, but they complain of the charge.

2568. But it depends upon what they pay for house rent?—A great deal depends upon that. We cannot guarantee rents at present.

2569. Have you heard much said of the rules of the Peabody Dwellings, and other dwellings of that kind, lately built, as a cause preventing the working classes from using the dwellings to the extent that they otherwise would?—At first they were irksome, but of late years they have been very much modified, and I hear very little complaint now.

2570. You said something about workmen not objecting to anything that did not interfere with their individual liberty ; you would not think that the rules amount to an interference with their individual liberty, would you?—So long as there was a rule that the place should be kept clean, it would be beneficial.

2571. Do you know the rules of the Peabody Buildings?—I have seen them, but they are not at present in my memory.

2572. With regard to the suggestion that the State should interfere, I understood you that the ground for your claim for an interference by the State, applied to any existing disturbance that had been caused by clearing certain districts ; and you suggest that as the only reason why the State should interfere, to provide better dwellings at lower rents?—I was confining myself within the meaning of the Act ; I have a wider opinion of my own.

2573. Did I understand you to mean that apart from the interference which has taken place in the dwellings of the lower classes in London, you would not be prepared, on behalf of those you represent, to propose any scheme of the kind ; do you put it merely upon the basis of the interference that has at present taken place?—Inasmuch as it is this Act which we are dealing with at present, it is as far as we can go, but my own opinions take a wider range.

2574. Speaking of those whom you represent, do you say that their view is that the State or municipality should go so far as to put the workmen in the same position in which they would have been if the clearances had not taken place ; that is to say, that they should provide as many dwellings as had been cleared away?—They ought to do that at least.

Mr. Thomas Abrey, called in ; and Examined.

Chairman.

2575. You are a carpenter and joiner, I believe, are you not?—Yes.

2576. Where do you live?—I live at 13, Ringcroft-street, Holloway.

2577. How long have you lived there?—Two years and six months.

2578. Where did you live before that?—King

Chairman—continued.

Edward-street, Liverpool-road, close to the Agricultural Hall.

2579. Have you come prepared to tell the Committee anything on behalf of the Trades' Council?—Yes, I have come to support the address which has been read.

2580. Will you tell me, in the first instance, your

Chairman—continued.

your opinion about sending these workmen who are displaced into the suburbs?—I think it is undesirable to send them into the suburbs, if convenient habitations can be erected on convenient sites, where the houses have been demolished.

2581. Have you anything to add to what the last witness said about the inconvenience of going into the suburbs?—It is very inconvenient. In the building trades, in many cases men have to get up at half-past four o'clock in the morning to catch the early trains to get into London at 20 minutes to six; they have to walk a mile or a mile and a-half to the place where they are engaged, and that is a great hardship; and they have to do the same thing at night.

2582. Is there anything else on that point which you wish to say?—As far as marketing is concerned, of course a great difference is felt there; where the wives could go to the markets and get the ordinary supplies, it is cheaper than going to these small retail shops which are found to exist in the suburbs.

2583. Have you known many workmen who have gone into the suburbs?—Yes, a great many in the building trades reside in the suburbs.

2584. When they go there do they stay there, or do they come back?—In many cases they stay, but in some cases they return, owing to the unfavourable nature of the workmen's trains.

2585. If the trains were made right, would they stay in the suburbs?—Undoubtedly they would.

2586. What recommendations would you make with regard to an alteration in the trains?—I recommend that they should run at intervals from five o'clock to eight o'clock in the morning, and that they should be no more than 1*s* a week, and that should be made compulsory by the Government.

2587. On all railways?—On all railways; and if the railways found it would not be remunerative to run them, and were to take objection against it on that ground, we think that the passenger duty on the trains should be abolished.

2588. Have you any objection to the Peabody Buildings?—Not individually.

2589. Is there any objection upon the part of the persons you represent here?—The persons whom I represent generally do not reside much in the Peabody Buildings, as they are forced into other block dwellings, such as the industrial dwellings, and others of that description.

2590. What do you say about them; have you any objection to them?—There is a block of dwellings called Huntingdon Dwellings in the Bethnal Green-road which we recommend as the most suitable we have seen. Many men live in them, and the give a better account of them; the rooms are commodious; more so than others. In the industrial dwellings the bedrooms are too small by far, 10 feet long by 7 feet 6 inches wide is too small for a bedroom by 2 or 3 feet; and in the Huntingdon Dwellings that defect is remedied satisfactorily.

2591. Have you anything which you wish to supplement to the statement made by the last witness?—I have, relative to buildings erected in the suburbs by individual enterprise; generally speaking, they are not properly surveyed during construction, and the construction is most faulty; for instance, the Building Acts in many cases cannot be complied with, because the houses are so very damp; for instance, the proper concrete footing is often neglected, and the damp-proof course above it.

Chairman—continued.

2592. Are you speaking of places within the power of the Metropolitan Board of Works, or outside that power?—Taking West Ham and Leyton, and those places, buildings are erected without proper care being taken that they shall be healthy habitations after they are erected.

2593. Is that outside the area of the Metropolitan Board of Works?—I do not know.

2594. The local authorities do not put the law in force?—No, the houses erected are very objectionable.

2595. Have you anything else to supplement?—No; we should like to see surveyors appointed who would see the work properly carried out.

2596. You would like to see the Buildings Acts much more stringently carried out in the suburbs?—Yes.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

2597. Do you attach great importance to cheap workmen's trains?—Yes, I attach great importance to cheap workmen's trains.

2598. Do you live in the suburbs yourself?—No, I live at the bottom of the Liverpool-road. I do not require them myself.

2599. But supposing that there were cheap workmen's trains in all directions, do you think men who now live in the centre of the town would live in the suburbs?—Many of them would still require to live in the centres, because they could not get away. Postmen, for instance, and market porters, and many others employed in such occupations could not live in the suburbs.

2600. Do you think a much greater number would live in the suburbs, especially in the western suburbs, if there were cheap trains?—I do.

2601. Supposing a clearance is made of any particular district, and it was ascertained that a considerable number of the working people living in the district were employed at a distance, do you think that it would be necessary to provide accommodation for those, or would it be sufficient to provide accommodation only for those who, living in that district, did not work within that district?—I think sufficient accommodation ought to be provided where these houses are demolished upon these sites, for the people who have been evicted or ejected.

2602. Supposing a certain proportion, say one-half or one-third, do not find employment in that district, but find employment at a distance from that district, do you think it is then necessary to provide house accommodation for that number?—Yes, I think it would be highly essential that house accommodation should be provided.

2603. Notwithstanding the fact that these particular people are not employed in the district?—In most cases where the houses are demolished, the people are employed in the district.

2604. The evidence before this Committee is that in a great number of cases the men so dispossessed are not employed in the district, but are employed at a distance; supposing that were a fact, do you think that then it would be neces-

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

sary to provide house accommodation for those people so dispossessed?—If that were the fact, it would not be necessary, because one-third of them could be provided for in the suburbs.

Mr. *Hastings.*

2605. We have had it in evidence from working men here that there are objections to working men's trains, however cheap they may be, in this way, that a man who is employed in London, if he has his home near, goes home and takes his dinner with his wife and family, and if he cannot do that, he must go to a cookshop or a public-house; do you think, from your experience, there is much in that objection?—I do not think there is much objection taken to it, because so many of us have to do it; it is the natural custom.

Mr. *Rankin.*

2606. Can you tell the Committee whether, when the workmen go to live out in the suburbs, their wives find any employment there?—I am not prepared to answer that question, but I should suggest that men who go out to live in the suburbs do not require their wives to find employment; they see to their own domestic arrangements.

2607. They are too well off?—They would not be too well off, but the wives would have sufficient to do to see to their own domestic arrangements, without seeking employment otherwise.

2608. Supposing that the passenger duty could not be removed from the trains, as you suggest, would it be a fair arrangement that the locality should supplement the railway companies from the rates, a price sufficient to make the workmen's trains pay?—That is a question that I have not thought out; I am not prepared to answer it. I have thought out in my own mind, as a satisfactory conclusion, that the railways should be compelled by the State to run these trains.

2609. Even at a loss?—I think that they ought to be compelled to run the trains, and that remuneration should be given to them by the State by taking off the duty, and then they ought to be compelled to run them.

2610. Have you any notion of the proportion of workmen whose houses are likely to be disturbed under these Acts?—No.

2611. Do you think that it would be a large proportion or a small proportion of the workmen?—I cannot say to what extent public works may go and be extended.

2612. I speak as to the action of these particular Acts of Parliament. You must remember that these Acts of Parliament are only put in force where the dwellings are in a very bad insanitary condition; is it your opinion that a large proportion of the workmen of London are at the present time living in these dwellings which are in an insanitary condition?—Yes, there are numbers of houses in an insanitary condition, and a number which may not be termed uninhabitable, but the sanitary conditions of which are very bad indeed.

2613. Do you think that to carry out these

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

Acts properly, or so as to have any appreciable effect, a very large proportion of the workmen would have to be dispossessed and turned out of their houses?—The evils existing in a number of houses might be altered by proper supervision and by the law which is in existence being carried out, compelling owners of property to put them in proper repair.

2614. But I want your opinion as to the amount of demolition which would be required under these Acts of Parliament for the improvement of artizans' dwellings, supposing they were properly carried out according to the spirit and intent of the Acts?—I have not sufficiently surveyed the areas to give a correct answer to that question.

2615. Do you think that a proper money payment to the person dispossessed would be satisfactory to them?—I think a money payment in many cases would not answer the purpose. I do not think it is so much a question of money as it is of convenience.

2616. Do you think that most of the artizans would prefer to own their own houses if they could do so upon any system of part payment?—It is a prevailing feeling amongst all working men that I have come in contact with; it is the aspiration they have to become the owners of their own houses.

2617. That is the general feeling you think?—Yes.

2618. Do many of them take steps to carry out that intention?—A number of them do by joining existing building societies.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2619. Are you working for yourself or are you working for a master?—I am employed by Mr. Grover the builder, in the New North-road.

2620. When you were at Islington, were you still working for him?—I am living there now.

2621. I thought you had moved from Islington to Holloway?—It is all in the parish of St Mary's, Islington.

2622. Is your work close at hand, or have you to move about?—At present it takes me about 20 minutes to walk to my employment.

2623. You walk to your employment I suppose; you do not go by train?—No.

2624. Do you think that the early morning trains conveying workmen to their work do not run at a late enough hour, as we heard from the last witness?—I think they do not run late enough; there are so many men besides those belonging to the engineering and building trades who are not required to get to their work before 8 o'clock, and some not before half-past 8; for instance, warehousemen and people of that kind; it comes hard upon them, having to pay full fares; and the engineering and building trades have an advantage over them.

2625. You speak most of railway traffic and trains, but I suppose the tramways have been very useful also to working men?—Upon the North London line, no trams run early enough for the engineering men or building men to get to work, they do not start till 20 minutes past 7.

2626. They do not start early enough, and the trains do not run late enough?—No.

2627. You

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

2627. You mentioned the Huntingdon Dwellings as being the most commodious; who do the Huntingdon Dwellings belong to?—I cannot say authoritatively, but I am informed they belong to a gentleman of the name of Allen.

2628. Do you know how many families are accommodated in the dwellings?—No; I do not.

2629. You say that the buildings in the suburbs, you think, are not properly inspected; have you any personal experience of the buildings in the suburbs?—I have not had so much personal experience as I have had personal complaints of the houses erected.

2630. That they are damp?—Yes; they are very damp indeed.

2631. And that the buildings are not sufficiently substantial?—Yes; and the material is generally bad, and the workmanship inferior, and the appliances of the most inferior kind; and they soon fail to answer the purposes for which they were placed in the houses.

2632. What district do you speak of generally?—Taking a general survey, where the speculative builders are at work without the proper supervision which we think ought to be used over them.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2633. You work for Mr. Grover I think you said?—Yes.

2634. Is he a large contractor, or builder, or what?—Both.

2635. Does he take contracts in different parts of London?—Yes.

2636. Then, I suppose, you sometimes have to go from your home more than 20 minutes' walk?—Sometimes I have to go as far as four miles to my work.

2637. So that it is not necessary absolutely for all working men, even of your superior class, to live absolutely near their work?—It would be much better if they could be near their work. What I mean is this, that having to go sometimes four miles to my work, if I were to be sent to do a job at Piccadilly, there would be no means of my getting there except by walking.

2638. You would not think of changing your lodgings, I suppose?—No; not for that particular job.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

2639. Your job may be anywhere?—Yes.

2640. And it is the same thing with many other working men like yourself, is it not, their job may be anywhere where their masters send them; is not that the case?—Yes; but there are many cases where the employment is more stationary than it is in the building trades.

2641. You may have to go to any part of the metropolis, though you live at Holloway?—Yes.

2642. Supposing that in any improvement for the artizans or any other improvement, the Metropolitan Board of Works were able to show that they had provided equally good dwellings within a fair distance, would it suit you as well as having model lodging-houses erected, or not?—It would not suit me so well, as far as my opinion is concerned, as having houses erected on the demolished sites, or as near as possible to the demolished sites.

2643. But if they were able to show you that there is a house within half a mile off, as comfortable and as good as the one you leave, would not that be satisfactory and sufficient?—If such a thing could be shown, I think it might meet the case.

2644. Are you aware that there are a good number of houses vacant in the metropolis and the neighbourhood; we have had evidence that there are hundreds and thousands!—Yes; there are always plenty of houses to let, but in many cases it is beyond the reach of workmen to hire them.

2645. But I am talking of workmen's houses, with tramways and trains; that would need your requirements, would it not?—It would meet the requirements of those whose occupations were of a somewhat transitory character; but not those whose occupations were more stationary in the district.

2646. It would meet the requirements of a certain portion of the working classes?—Yes.

2647. I may take it, may I not, that at least half of the working classes might be accommodated in that way?—I would not say half.

2648. You will allow that a considerable number might be accommodated in that way?—Yes.

Mr. Charles Hodson, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2649. You live at 69, Shaftesbury-street, Hoxton, I believe?—Yes.

2650. What are you?—I am at the present time the messenger of the United States Legation, and have been such for the last four years, but for the previous 16 years I was a compositor in some of the largest offices in London, and I am at present secretary to a saving fund of working men and women; I am also connected with other societies, in which I meet a good number of working men.

2651. Have you heard the questions that have been put to the previous witnesses, as to how far it is wise to allow people to find their own dwellings in the country, or in the suburbs, when a demolition takes place, and how far it is necessary to provide accommodation for them in some shape or form, in the centre of London; what is your opinion upon that point?—Unlike the two previous witnesses, I have been an inmate of one of the blocks of industrial dwellings for seven years, and I have had considerable experience of them, and I am very much in favour of the plans for men with families living in blocks of buildings for reasons which I may give at once. For one reason (quite in contradiction to the evidence of a witness that I read in the newspaper the other day), on account of the great privacy that the dwellers in the buildings have. If I am compelled, as a working man, to live in a house in which three or four other families live, which is the case of a great many working men, especially in the centre of London, we all enter from a common door; we go up the common stairs, and pass each other's doors, which

Chairman—continued.

may be open, and there must be neeessarily almost an intermingling of families; but in the model dwellings there is no such thing; a man enters his own door, and no one enters the same door but himself, and he has the utmost privacy, and he may be a hermit, and no one to speak to him, or he speak to any one else; and also in contradiction to the evidence which has been laid before the Committee, I may say, as to the great restrictions put upon the tenants in these houses, after living, as I say for over seven years in one of them, there is nothing but the most perfect liberty. The dwelling I lived in was in the Palmerston Buildings, belonging to the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company. No one interfered with you so long as liberty did not deseend to license; there was no way in which the man or wife was interfered with, but in the whole time I was there, I knew hardly any eases in which the officers of the Company were called upon to interfere, and when they did interfere, it was in consequence of some man or woman not having seen to his or her proper share of keeping the passage clean, and it was always done in a very proper manner.

2652. You say you approve of the system of model dwellings?—Yes, very much so.

2653. Then how far would it be safe to let all these people go into the country, or suburbs, without providing some such building as these?—I know several eases in which people have left the buildings in which I lived, and I also know plenty of fellow-workmen in the offices in which I was employed who have tried going out to the suburbs, and they have been compelled to return to town again.

2654. Will you tell us why?—One reason is the enhanced cost of living; one man I worked with lived at Tottenham, he was compelled to return; he said the price of butcher's meat was at least 3 *d.* a pound more at Tottenham than he could buy it for at the Meat Market; I have a large family of 10 children, and to me, when I was a workman, it would have been impossible to have lived out with this enhanced cost of living; there is another reason why I think workmen object to living in the country, and I have talked with a good many of them, they object to be thrust from their work in the City, and I think their reason would be this: a man has not only the railway fare of himself into town, to come to work in the morning and returning at night, but if he has a family, he expects to find employment for them as they leave school; he has not only the cost of the railway fare for himself, but for his children and his wife to come to a cheap market; she cannot go to a shop in the suburbs and buy; she has not a good market; she cannot purchase the same things in the suburb as in London, therefore it entails the cost of conveyance to town; I knew myself several eases in the buildings in which I lived from which respectable men went with their families into the suburbs, and who have had to return. There was eight or nine years ago a very great objection on the part of working men to go into these buildings, thinking they were going to be subjected to many restraints; as my family increased, and I lived in apartments, it was impossible for me to retain those I had, or to get others. A friend of mine, by force of circumstances, was driven into the Palmerston Buildings; he liked them so much that he asked me to go and see them; I went and saw them, and I saw that what appeared to be a bug-bear was really a great boon; I liked them so much that at the first opportunity I became an inmate of them myself; a year and three months ago I left them, and took a house for myself; my position was improved, and I was able to take a house; there was one principal reason why I gave up living in the buildings, and that was this, that there was no provision made in the erection of these buildings for some playground for the children; and I do hope this Committee will, if they have any means of doing so, bear this in mind in their Report; it is a most important point; with regard to the buildings I was in, there was no play-ground for the children of any kind whatever; the only playground which the children could have was the street; and, therefore, it entailed taking them away, which we could do for the sum of 2 *d.*, right to Finsbury Park: I think myself there is the means, even with the same cost of site, for the building to be utilised and a playground made for little children; they are flat roofs, and with a high parapet they might utilise the roofs.

Chairman—continued.

2655. In many of them they do?—Not in those in which I lived. That was what caused me to give up living there.

2656. You were a compositor; could you, following your business and trade as a compositor, have gone out into the country?—It was impossible; I was employed at a Parliamentary house, the firm of Messrs. Harrison & Sons, St. Martin's-lane, and during the Parliamentary Session we are at work at hours varying from 10 at night to 11 and 12 the next day.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2657. You said you were secretary or manager of a savings fund?—Yes.

2658. For what purpose especially is the fund intended, to purchase dwellings, or merely to encourage habits of thrift?—I can give a short history of the fund, which is a very remarkable one; some men gave over drinking beer——

2659. What was the date?—It was some five years ago.

2660. How many were there at the beginning?—The number could be counted on my five fingers; that was in 1877; their first weekly saving was 1 *l.*; they saved this so that at the end of the year they might make some use of the money; in the first year we saved 125 *l.*; in the next year we saved 240 *l.* odd; the next year we saved 400 *l.* odd; the next year we saved 700 *l.*; last year we saved 968 *l.*; and this year we shall save something like 1,400 *l.*

Chairman.

2661. How many has your society increased to now?—I believe we have now in the society 432 members. The men find they can save much better there than in the Post Office Savings Bank; but the great bulk of the money they save goes into the Post Office Savings Bank; but

Chairman—continued.

but now Mr. Blashill, the churchwarden of St. Matthew's, City-road, has some scheme which he is going to propound, by which he thinks that the savings of the men could be utilised in building such blocks of buildings as the present, because a great many men know the benefit of them; in fact, in the neighbourhood in which I live, there is a long list of applicants waiting to take their turn to get into them.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2662. As yet you have not appropriated your savings?—As yet we have not appropriated our savings, but I hope that means will be taken of doing so.

2663. With a view to better dwellings?—To the utilising of these savings; to the purchasing property or in some measure paying our rent; in short, something like the scheme of a building society, only it would be a scheme we could commence at once.

2664. Do you know any instance of a similar society that has applied its savings to dwellings?—I do not, but I remember a long time before I had any money to invest, the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company sent round a scheme by which it would have been virtually the same thing. The tenants were allowed special privileges in taking shares in the Industrial Dwellings Company; there was to be no transfer fee; and if I was a tenant of a building, I should try to make myself virtually my own landlord by taking shares in the Improved Dwellings Company to the extent that would pay my rent.

2665. Then a working man who was thrifty would belong to a joint stock concern?—Yes, and be his own landlord.

2666. How many have availed themselves of that opportunity?—I do not know of any one.

2667. Are you a member of a building society?—No, I am not a member of a building society.

2668. Are you able to state whether any proportion of those who live by wage labour in London could afford, without great sacrifice, to live in the suburbs?—I cannot say that any could without a sacrifice go to live in the suburbs. The only cases that I know of that left the Buildings returned on account of the immense cost of necessaries and travelling. There are plenty of trades that could not go to live in the suburbs; for instance, few compositors could do it.

2669. But many persons who live by weekly wages in the condition of clerks and others could afford to live there, and pay too?—It may be.

2670. If the minority are provided with the means of living comfortably out of town, does not the space that they vacate in the town improve the condition of those who are obliged to remain?—I cannot say; that is a question more for an engineer than myself; I am afraid I could not answer that question.

2671. Generally speaking, your evidence is that provision must be made where demolition takes place, by which you are not to be subjected to great hardships?—No doubt.

2672. Have you ever considered on whom the charge should fall; upon the locality, the parish, or the town at large, or the whole community, of making this reparation?—That I cannot give an answer to.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

2673. You are not prepared to state the views of your society upon that subject?—No, but I should say that I cannot think that the views enunciated by the previous witness are very sound views, because I can see that in some way or other the cost would come back on me, or on the body of the ratepayers, who are the working classes, to a great extent; it is certainly not sound. I should imagine that the London Trades Council would object to such views as have been promulgated in their name.

2674. That we will not go into, but your opinion is rather contrary to what some witnesses have stated to-day?—Yes.

2675. If the reparation is to be made where demolition takes place, have you any distinct idea how that may be done without loss to the community?—I do not see that; it has always been to me something most unaccountable. Sir Sydney Waterlow's investment has been called five per cent. philanthropy; there is no philanthropy about it, it is paying five per cent. with a handsome reserve fund. I cannot see how, with these buildings having lots of applicants waiting to come in, that opposite to these very buildings there should be a row of hovels just one storey above the kitchens. I should like to see power given to the State by which these hovels could be demolished, and such buildings as I lived in erected in their stead.

2676. But practically you know by observation that the hovels remain; that they are not voluntarily improved, and that better buildings are not erected?—Yes, it has always been a great surprise to me.

2677. Are you not aware that there is an insuperable difficulty in the way of such a change as you desire, in the impossibility of compelling persons, without legal enactments, to surrender the sites; that the property belongs to a great number of persons who cannot be got without compulsion to surrender it to some public authority?—I have always been under the impression, since I have been able to think about it, that the State ought to have the power of clearing these sites and facilitating the erection upon them of suitable dwellings.

2678. It ought to be given to some public authority, do you think?—I think it ought to be given to some public authority, to compel private individuals to surrender insanitary sites.

2679. The State would not give that power to private individuals, but the State has given power in the Act of 1868, and in the Act of 1875, to public authorities to take it by compulsion, and to compensate?—I think that that principle ought to be extended, in the interests of the working classes.

2680. Have you observed what takes place when great demolitions have taken place, either under Sir Richard Cross's Act, or under mine, in the way of inconvenience to people who have been dispossed?—I have not observed it. No case of inconvenience has come under my observation.

2681. You have not heard what has been done then in Golden-lane, which is not far from you?—No I have not.

2682. Is it your opinion that numerous dispossession inevitably work hardships to the people, by dislocating their general occupations, and by compelling them to seek homes at a distance?—I can

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

I can imagine that it must entail some amount of inconvenience and expense to those dispossessed, and in a great many cases the men who live in the locality work in the locality. I know in Clerkenwell in the working men's club, of which I am secretary, some of the men are watchmakers and diamond setters, and that class of men who work in the locality.

2683. If they were dispossessed by new works to-morrow in Clerkenwell, what would they do?—They would still have to live somewhere about their work.

2684. To overcrowd the neighbouring localities?—Yes; they could not go away from their work. A man gets a diamond ring to set or to mend, or watch jobbing to do, which takes a short time, and as soon as it is finished it is taken into the warehouse from which it is given out. It is almost impossible that they can do otherwise than live on the spot in which they are employed.

2685. You are probably aware that the plan is already matured, and may this year be executed, of making a new street from Holborn Town Hall, through Clerkenwell, up to the Angel?—I have heard something of it.

2686. If that street be executed, it will necessarily entail the dispossession of a great number of working people?—Yes, decidedly.

2687. The locality is very full at present, is it not?—Yes, undoubtedly; Mr. Evans can tell you better than I can about that.

2687.* Do you think that where any large improvement plan is contemplated, entailing the necessity of extensive demolitions of houses occupied by the working classes, provision ought to be made simultaneously, or from time to time, for those who are dispossessed, and not that the whole district should be laid bare at once, and the people left to find houses for themselves?—I think it should certainly be done piecemeal.

2688. Will you explain what you mean by piecemeal?—I should think this inconvenience, for inconvenience there must necessarily be, would be very much intensified the greater the area over which it extended.

2689. For example, in a large street in the centre of a town?—If a road a mile long were to be cut through a crowded neighbourhood, and the inhabitants along that road were people whose employment led them to live there, if you cleared the whole mile at once the evil would be very much more intensified than if you were to take a fourth of it, at four different periods, and clear and erect as you went along.

2690. Have you ever heard any complaint or discontent expressed by men of your own class as to the want of provision being made promptly for those dispossessed?—I have heard great complaints, but I cannot specify any particular complaint.

Mr. *Rankin.*

2691. Do you think it very often occurs that men of your class, in the receipt of good wages, are dispossessed of these houses; I am speaking now, of course, of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts, not of the Street Improvements Acts, because that possibly might require some good houses as well as bad; I refer to Acts relating to bad houses, which require to be demolished in consequence of their insanitary condition; do men of your stamp very often live in such houses?—I should not think, as a class, that they do.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

2692. In point of fact, it is a very different class altogether?—The houses I have in my eye are occupied by men and families of a different stamp to my own; the lower working class.

2693. Have you known any persons who have been dispossessed of those houses through the operation of the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—None personally.

2694. Then you do not know personally what their complaints or feelings may be upon the matter?—I do not.

2695. You do not know whether a money payment upon dispossession will satisfy them?—Yes; I imagine that a money payment on dispossession would satisfy them; but I should imagine also that the evil would be still present, and that if they were dispossessed and no means found of housing them, that that would merely make more over-crowding in the immediate neighbourhood.

2696. You spoke of the accommodation of the Palmerston Buildings, have you any knowledge of a different class of building such as you spoke of, known as "barracks"?—I believe that since the Palmerston Building was erected, which was almost one of the earliest blocks of buildings for the improvement of dwellings, the comforts and sanitary arrangements have been improved.

2697. Are you speaking of a class of buildings to accommodate much poorer persons than yourself and men of your stamp?—I do not know any great buildings except the ones in which I resided; I cannot speak of any other buildings.

2698. Do you think it would be desirable that they should be erected?—If they have the same conveniences without the same ornamentation, I think it would be very desirable for any class.

2699. Do you think the people dispossessed from these very insanitary houses, coming under these Acts of Parliament, would take advantage of these buildings and live in them?—I do not see why they should not. From what I understand the rents of these poor squalid houses are even higher than what are paid for admirable dwellings; necessarily they would like them better if they paid less rents for them, and had better conveniences; they must like them better.

2700. You speak of being secretary to a Saving Fund Society?—Yes.

2701. From your knowledge, are there many of the working men in your class, who are putting by in saving societies for the sake of building?—I do not know any; but this scheme which is being propounded, I have no doubt will lead some of them to invest in building.

2702. You have never heard of the Starr-Bowkett Societies?—I have.

2703. Do many men in your class of life belong to them?—Yes; a good many compositors belong to those societies.

Mr. *Bryce.*

2704. I understand you to say that the cost of living

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

living was a great deal heavier in Tottenham than in the centre of London?—Yes.

2705. With the enhanced cost of living greater than the lower cost of rent, has a man to pay more for his dearer living than he gains by the additional cheapness of rent?—The man whom I had in my mind's eye, who specially complained of it, said that the enhanced cost of living was very much more than the decreased rent; he was a prudent, careful man, and he made himself a sort of light porter, and bought his things in London, and took them down to Tottenham.

2706. Are you speaking of only one individual case?—Yes, but I have heard complaints from workmen living in the suburbs, and they say it is more costly.

2707. You talked of turning the roofs of the houses into playgrounds for the children; is not it the fact that the flat roofs are used for drying clothes?—Yes, but a portion could be used for that purpose, and no doubt a portion could be used for recreation for the children. That was a very great blot, in my estimation, upon those buildings in which I lived.

2708. In the buildings you speak of, was there anything in the nature of a lending library or reading rooms connected with them?—Nothing of the kind.

2709. Has it ever occurred to you that one or two rooms on the ground floor might be used as a reading room for the inhabitants of the building?—My experience of that is not a very favourable one, even if it was there; for in the workmen's club, of which I am secretary, we have at the present time a lending library, and we are very glad to lend books to the members, and they have the evening papers, and that kind of thing; but they are men who work at sedentary occupations, and who do not, after they have finished watch-making, or even picking up type, want to read anything further during the day; they want a club where they can smoke a pipe, or have a game of billiards, or chess, or whist.

2710. I asked you the question, because the plan of having the reading room has been found very successful in artizans' dwellings in some parts of America, where they have been introduced, and I thought you might have had similar experience here, but you have had no such experience?—I have no experience of that, except the fact of the provision we have made for reading; and that the books are on the shelves, and are rarely used.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2711. What model dwellings did you live in; the Peabody Buildings?—The Improved Industrial Dwellings Company.

2712. You are no longer living in them?—I am no longer living in them.

2713. Would you go back to them if you could?—I would not, because I have a garden in which my children can play.

2714. In Hoxton?—Yes.

2715. When did you first go into the model dwellings?—A little over eight years ago, and I stayed in them seven years.

2716. Can you tell us what you were earning then per week?—I suppose I was earning about 44 *s.* a week, on the average.

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

2717. Some of the model dwellings have a restriction against admitting any one who is earning such wages as that?—None of the improved industrial dwellings have, that I know of. I was not taken in in charity; it is only the Peabody Buildings into which the question of charity enters. I was paying 5 per cent., and helping to establish a good reserve fund for the people who let me my apartments.

2718. In those dwellings you did not find that the restrictions were irksome?—Not in the least.

2719. Did they allow you to sub-let?—I did not want to sub-let, unfortunately; I have too many in my family to do that.

2720. Were not there restrictions as to cleaning the stairs outside your room?—Yes, which were not irksome; they were proper, and all the people fell into them as a matter of course; it was not and should not be irksome.

2721. Were not there restrictions as to the hour you should come in in the evening?—No; I was a compositor, and I went in at every hour of the clock, day and night.

2722. And you found the privacy and quiet was very acceptable?—Very acceptable indeed.

2723. Would not it have been the case that some of the lodgers might have complained very much if you had a children's playground underneath the windows?—We had no playground.

2724. But you say you wished that you had had?—Yes, that was a great blot; that was one reason why I was always looking out for a house.

2725. Would not the other tenants in a house complain very much of the noise the children made in the playground?—Not if it was at the top of the house; if it were nowhere else I imagine it could be there, but if it were in the basement of the house, I do not see that there could be any more objection than to living next door to a board school; it may not be pleasant, but if you hear a lot of children playing, and you know some of your own are assisting to kick up the uproar, you can put up with it.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2726. You live in Shaftesbury-street, Hoxton?—Yes.

2727. How far is that from your work?—It is about three-quarters of an hour's walk.

2728. Do not you find that inconvenient?—I mostly ride.

2729. There are omnibuses and trains that you can go by?—Yes, I can get from Shaftesbury-street, Hoxton, to the bottom of Parliament-street for 4 *d.*

2730. Have you observed in Shaftesbury-street, whether there were any vacant dwellings for people?—A house is never empty for more than 10 minutes.

2731. Are there not some vacant houses there?—No, they are only unoccupied for a few minutes.

2732. The locality is very much sought after?—I do not know of vacant houses for the working classes in London; I do not see them; if there is a vacant house, there is a good reason why it is vacant; there are bad drains, or there has been fever in the house, or the landlord is rack-renting it.

2733. Are the houses usually occupied by one

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

or more families?—The houses are sometimes occupied by two or three families.

2734. Is not Hoxton practically almost on the verge of a suburb of London?—No, it is a very short distance from the City-road.

2735. But there is country close by, is there not?—No, not for a long way.

2736. Can you get out in the country by a quarter of an hour's walk?—By 20 minutes' walk, or something like that.

2737. So that you do not represent people living in the centre of London?—The neighbourhood I live in is thickly populated by working men.

2738. If any public body had an improvement to make, and they were able to show any competent authority that houses were to be given to artizans as good as those they were dispossessed of, would you have any objection to that; would you think it would be fair?—Yes; I think it would be perfectly fair.

2739. Then you would not think it necessary for a public authority to have to erect houses, if there were vacant houses within a reasonable distance?—I should like to know the reasons of the vacancies, because I know a lot of men in the same position as myself who would be glad to get a house, and would take it to-morrow if vacant; but as to these houses that are to let, there is some good reason why they are not taken; there may be some very expensive fittings that a man does not want to take, or the drains may be bad, or there may be a floor-cloth manufactory close by, or something of that sort. Within a circuit including Hoxton, you may safely say that there are no houses to let that are advantageous for a working man to take; none.

2740. We have it in evidence that there are

Sir *James M'Garel Hogg*—continued.

many thousands?—Then you must get further out than the circuit including Hoxton.

2741. You said something in answer to an honourable Member, that if any public body were to make an improvement it ought to be done in sections; do you know anything about improvements; have you had any experience of them?—Not a bit.

2742. It is only an idea of your own?—Judging from a common sense view of the question, if you decrease the area of inconvenience, you lesson the inconvenience.

2743. I suppose you are aware that if you want to erect houses, you must demolish first, and not only demolish enough to put houses on, but to make roads and approaches, otherwise nobody would take the land from you?—Yes; one of the former witnessess said there was a great delay in clearing the sites, and the great delay in the erection of houses upon them has always struck me, not understanding the cause; it shows that we men, who have no practical knowledge of the subject, should not form opinions. I fall in with the views expressed by that witness, that there always seems a very long delay between the pulling down of houses and the erection of others, and it seemed to me that that in a great measure was the cause of the great cost; because if two years elapse from the time you eject a tenant to the time that you put in a tenant, who pays you, that again means a loss on capital lying idle.

2744. Considering you have no practical experience, you think it is not wise to form too definite an opinion on the subject?—I say so; it would not be sensible in me to form a definite opinion.

Mr. Alfred Evans, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2745. You are a house painter, I believe?—I am a grainer,

2746. Do you live at No. 5, Barclay-court, Red Lion-street, Clerkenwell?—Yes.

2747. How long have you lived there?—Ten years.

2748. Do you live in a house with your family by yourself?—I let a portion of it off.

2749. You have heard the evidence of the last witness; will you tell us whether you agree with him generally in what he said?—I have heard complaints about the model dwellings, the barrack-like appearance of some of them, and the outside staircases; I have heard great objections to those.

2750. You have never lived in them yourself?—No.

2751. Supposing there is a great street to be cut through a crowded place in London, and a great number of houses pulled down in consequence, inhabited by the working classes, is it right to leave these men to go out to the suburbs and find their own homes; or do you think, on the other hand, that some fresh accommodation should be built?—My candid opinion is that those who pull the houses down should be com-

Chairman—continued.

pelled to provide good substantial houses in lieu of those they have demolished, and I would suggest eight or ten-roomed houses, such as working men could afford to live in.

2752. Do you know any of your companions who have gone to live in the suburbs?—Yes, plenty who have gone into the suburbs have been glad to get back again.

2753. What part of the suburbs have they gone to?—A little way out, about Tottenham, on account of the others being demolished; and that is getting as thickly populated as some of the places where they had been driven from.

2754. Have the rents been cheaper there?—They have, but on account of the great demand the rents have been raised.

2755. What has brought the people back again?—They have come back on account of the overcrowding; and the railway is a great drawback.

2756. What fault do they find with the railway?—People in the building trade have to get to work at six o'clock; and if they happen to miss the workmen's train in the morning they cannot get to work until seven, eight or nine o'clock,

Chairman—continued.

o'clock, and if that is repeated, they very often get discharged from their employment; and not only that, but while they wait for the train, they do at times go into either coffee-houses or public-houses, and spend money when they should be earning it.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2757. You think it is an unhandy way of coming to their work, having to come from a great distance?—Yes.

2758. And you think the distance they have to come takes a great deal of time?—Yes.

2759. And they must either take it off their sleep at night, or take it out of their pockets?—They have to take it out of both; out of time and pockets too. My opinion is that the great want of houses in London is driving the people out, and hence they are obliged to adopt this sort of residence almost as a last resource; and I have had it come under my knowledge where I have had even to discharge men on account of their losing trains in the morning.

2760. What effect has that dislocation of the people, and the driving them out, upon friendly societies and saving societies?—It is one of the greatest drawbacks we have to put up with. In a court of foresters to which I belong, at our very last meeting the introducer of a motion had to leave on account of living out in the country; and for that very reason the business could not be conducted; and, moreover, in driving the members away, they lose their interest in the societies and finally they fall out of them, and that I think is a great drawback, and not only is it a drawback, but it increases pauperism; it is doing away with the habits of thrift which the men would indulge in if they could get comfortable homes in London.

2761. Do you know at all whether the suburban occupancies of the people who are driven out, are exclusively the working class, or are they mingled with middle class houses?—The middle classes go out first, and as the poorer classes follow them the middle class people think their dignity is touched, and they get farther out.

2762. Is the general tendency of this change of the habitations of the people to draw classes more together, or to sever them more from those of a different condition?—I hardly understand your question, but the reason of their going altogether is because their families increase, and they are obliged to crowd together where they can.

2763. Is that more the case with suburban dwellings than with those in the centre of the town?—I think so; the fact is they really cannot get places in London.

2764. Do you think it desirable that the working classes should be compelled to reside *en masse* without any diffusion of other classes?—No, I do not think so.

2765. Have you heard any complaints made recently of the number of people who are obliged to seek dwellings in the suburbs?—Yes, I have heard repeated complaints; in fact, cases are brought under my notice almost every week of men who were obliged to leave London and go into the suburbs and who would be glad to get

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

back, and I have known them come back at very great expense to themselves.

2766. Do you think it tends to worse social deterioration, and to inebriety or lax habits?—I think it does, inasmuch as if the men miss the train in the morning, they go into a public-house; in fact, I have known them to go into a public-house just to wait for the train, and they have stopped there all day; that is an exception, and not the rule.

2767. With reference to the replacement of dwellings where great works and improvements are taking place, do you think it would be possible or desirable that the replacement should be in the form of ordinary streets and courts rather than those of large blocks?—I think there should be some good substantial buildings built, and my own idea is that they should be houses of eight or ten rooms, so constructed that two families could live in them without interfering with one another.

2768. More resembling those that now exist?—Not resembling our model dwellings. Eight or ten-roomed houses.

2769. More resembling the houses in an ordinary street?—Yes, so that a man could get decent apartments for about one-fifth of his general earnings.

2770. Will you tell the Committee what your general impression is of the size of the houses occupied by men who live by wage labour, whether two-storey houses or four-storey?—Two, three and four; but they are generally let off to separate families.

2771. But where two-storey houses now exist, have you any doubt that they might be replaced by houses of greater, but not extravagant height?—Where they are only two storeys now they might be replaced by three and four-storey houses, so that more families could live in them.

2772. Without detriment to health?—Without detriment to health.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2773. Do you work for yourself?—I am leading man to Mr. Osborne, the sub-contractor to the Board of Works.

2774. Which Board of Works?—My employer is the sub-contractor for Mowlem and Sons, Government contractors.

2775. Where are you working now?—At the present time our job lies at the Wandsworth Police Court.

2776. How far from there are you living?—Four or five miles.

2777. You spoke just now about the workingmen not being able to get up and go into the country; how long does it take you to go your five miles?—It is on account of the great facilities of the Underground Railway; if we live in the centre of London we can get over in a few minutes.

2778. Would not the converse apply to that, if anybody out in the country lived near a railway they could get to their work equally as well as you can?—No, they have not the same facilities; they have not the penny and twopenny Parliamentary tickets, which they have upon the Underground Railway.

2779. If you go out you come back the same way?—Yes.

2780. Cannot a man who lives out, come in and

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

out the same way?—Not by penny Parliamentary trains, because there are certain restrictions with working-men's tickets, they cannot go back till a certain time in the afternoon.

2781. You do not understand me; if you, living in a certain district in the centre of London, have to go five miles to your work, any working-man living in Wandsworth can get in and out by the same sort of train, quite as well as you can go out and in?—Yes, but you must please to understand that my work does not always lie there; to-morrow I may be at work in these very buildings, so that it would be easy for me to get there.

2782. What I gather from you is that you are under a contractor, and you may have to work five, six, or seven miles away from where you are living, and often have to do so?—Yes.

2783. That is the case, and you can do it quite comfortably?—Yes.

2784. May I ask why those who wish to live in the country are not able to come into London to do their work equally well; is there any difficulty in it?—If anybody is working for our firm, you see what a difficulty it would be, if they lived in the suburbs, to come to our present job at Wandsworth Police Court; it would not be so easy for them to get from Enfield, and Edmonton, to the Wandsworth Police Court, as from Clerkenwell. That is rather an extreme distance, Wandsworth Police Court, for our work principally lies about the Government offices, and about the City.

2785. You do not agree with me that a man can come in from the country to do his work quite as easily as you can go out five miles?—No, for this reason, that he cannot get to Wandsworth Police Court so well as I can.

2786. Supposing I was a working man, living in the suburbs, near a railway, and I had work to do in London, five miles distant, do you mean to say I could not go by that same train that you use, morning and night; why should I not be able to do my work in London and go back to my family just as you can do your work in the centre of London and go out to your family?—It would cost more money; you would have to come up at a certain time, whereas I can go with a Parliamentary ticket any time during the day.

2787. Are these facilities given only one way?—Both ways.

2788. Then I could take advantage of the facilities to come into London in the same way?—There are not the facilities on the suburban railways.

2789. But on some of them there are?—I do not know any; they have the workmen's trains, but not the Parliamentary tickets that we can get upon the Metropolitan Railway.

2790. You said just now that if houses were cleared away, you think it would be much better to have eight or 10 roomed houses; if an area has to be cleared, it is generally closely packed with very bad streets, and everything in a very bad condition as regards its sanitary state; if you want to replace the number of people, how can you do it in eight or 10 roomed houses where you have to increase the size of your streets, and make the approaches better, and give more ventilation?—I presume that those who take this question in hand, if they found that eight or 10 roomed houses were not large enough, would make an addition afterwards.

2791. Then you have no objection to model dwellings and lodgings?—I have a strong objection to them on account of the barrack-like appearances, the outside staircases, and the great danger to the children, and there being no playground; in fact, I have had it told to me that the women are in constant fear on account of the staircases for the children.

2792. But they are occupied all the same?—Yes, they are occupied as I have been told as a last resource, simply because the people cannot get houses to go in if they have a family.

2793. How is that, when the fact is that there are a number of names on the list of people seeking to come in?—Yes; but in nine cases out of 10 they have a very large family and cannot get anywhere else, I think.

2794. Then you do not agree with the last witness, who said he was very happy there, and lived there seven years, and that the restrictions did not weigh upon him?—He has a large family he says unfortunately; but I believe a man is fortunate who has a large family; but that is the reason why he lived their chiefly.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2795. I suppose you recognise that with the growth of the population of London, it is perfectly impossible to house all the workmen who work in London, in London?—With the growth of the population, I presume they would add to to the buildings.

2796. But is not the greater part of London densely built over at present?—Yes, but they are principally built over with large warehouses; I think that where they compel the people to leave, they should build proper dwelling-houses in lieu of the large warehouses that seem to be springing up all over London.

2797. People build warehouses because they are convenient for their business?—Yes.

2798. And if you stop their doing that, you stop a great deal of business, and therefore stop a great deal of the employment of the people?—Yes, you do that.

2799. I suppose the question of coming in from the suburbs is really, to a great extent, a question of trains, is it not; if the train service was more convenient, a great many poor people would use them, would they not?—It is a great detriment to trade the trains not being frequent enough, or not having the requirements up to the great demand there is for them.

2800. You spoke of the workmen at Tottenham losing their train; if there were several trains they would not have that inconvenience?—Then they would lose their time in the morning.

2801. But that is merely a question of being punctual?—Yes.

2802. Then, as to the friendly societies, do not they spring up in the suburbs?—Yes, they spring up in the suburbs. I happen to belong to a society, and we formed ourselves into a committee, each one of us being determined to found a lodge of Oddfellows. Out of eight of us, only two of us could manage to get our branches founded in London, on account of the people being sent out; the remaining members

Mr. *Hollond*—continued.

members established lodges in the suburbs; but through the want of attention, or something of the kind, they have not succeeded as they should have done. We find, as a rule, people in the country do not look after them. Consequently, we send men down from London at a great expense to the societies.

2803. But when you have great populations springing up in the suburbs, it is an advantage that the friendly societies should follow them, is it not?—Yes.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2804. I understood you to say that you thought the last witness who was before us was fortunate when he wished to go into model dwelling-houses, because he had a large family?—No, I say he was fortunate in having a large family.

2805. You were asked as to your objections to model dwellings, and I believe you heard from the last witness that his experience was that the restrictions were not irksome, and that they were very nice places to live in?—I say I have heard of great objection to the barrack-like appearance of them, and to the outside staircases, and there also being no play-ground for the children; and there is great danger to the children in going up and down the stairs. I have heard it said by women that they have to watch them, and go from top to bottom with them. Some children are more likely to run into danger than others.

2806. Have all the model dwellings outside staircases?—Most of them, I believe.

Mr. *Rankin.*

2807. With regard to the question of playgrounds, you said that was one of the objections to the model buildings?—Yes.

2808–9. Have all houses in London playgrounds for the children?—They principally have yards or gardens.

2810. They have gardens at the back of the houses?—Yes.

2811. Those gardens are too small to grow vegetables in, are they not?—I do not expect there is room enough to make a kitchen garden.

2812. Do you think that artizans of your class look upon gardens as a benefit or a luxury?—It would be a benefit to the children, so that they could have a play-ground. I do not think there is much luxury attached to it in London.

2813. I am speaking generally?—Generally I do not see how it could be a luxury to them.

2814. As supplying them with vegetables?—It would be an accommodation to them, but not a luxury.

2815. In these suburban places that the artizans go to, from the centre of the town, are there not post-office savings banks and penny savings banks, and things of that sort?—There are in most of them; if there are not, there soon will be under the able superintendence of the present Postmaster General.

2816. So that if your men are of a saving disposition, they can be so in the country, just as well as they can in London?—Yes.

2817. Would you not think that the time occupied in travelling to and fro from suburban residences would act to a great extent in preventing men going into public-houses, as well as enticing them in?—I do not think so.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

2818. You admit that losing trains must be the exception rather than the rule?—Yes, it is the exception and not the rule, but cases very often come under my notice.

2819. Are there not thousands of cases which do not come under your notice where the men come in regularly?—Yes, and thousands of other cases of missing trains which do not come under my notice.

2820. Do the persons who live in these houses that are to be demolished under the Act of Parliament, called the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, occupy houses with eight or ten rooms in them?—They take them and sub-let part of the house, as a rule.

2821. Have you known personally many of the people who have been dispossessed from their houses?—Yes, I have known some of them to go out of London, and I have known them glad to come back again, and, in fact, they get in anywhere they possibly can. Now the house I live in is right in the centre of London, and I have been offered money to go out of it by a person on account of his not being able to get any house; it is very seldom that we see any houses of the kind to let round Clerkenwell.

2822. Is your house of a character likely to be demolished?—I hope not.

2823. Do artizans of your stamp live in houses that are likely to be demolished?—Yes, I believe so.

2824. Are they living in houses in an insanitary condition?—They are obliged to take them because they cannot get anywhere else; they cannot go out of London.

2825. Do I understand you to say that the great mass of artizans in London live in houses in an insanitary condition?—No, I do not think so. There is just this drawback; some of the landlords, even if you complain to them, will not put their houses in thorough repair.

2826. Do you think that those arrangements are better carried out in the country than they are in London?—No, I do not think so; in fact, I am sure not. In some of the suburbs the houses that they build now are built upon dust-heaps; they are not fit for dogs to live in.

2827. Then the people do not gain by the sanitary arrangements in the suburbs?—No.

2828. With regard to the dearness of the markets in the suburbs, and the difficulty of procuring provisions; is that a want generally felt, do you think?—I believe it is.

2829. Do you think that is only a temporary difficulty, or that it will remain so?—It will remain, I believe.

2830. Why do you think it will remain?—The excessive price of provisions will remain.

2831. Why should you think so?—Because of the great difficulty in getting them from London and other places.

2832. Surely if the demand is sufficient in the suburbs, it is not any further from the country, where the things come from; beef and mutton and things of that kind come from the country, and not London?—Amongst the butchers there is a monopoly, and if they find that the tenants in the neighbourhood cannot get anything else, and are bound to deal with them, they will keep the prices up.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

2833. Surely there is a sufficient number of butchers to go into another trade, if necessary, to supply the suburbs?—I do not understand the question.

2834. There is great competition in the trade?—Yes; and to counteract that there is such a monopoly amongst them that they can drive the trade whichever way they like.

Chairman.

2835. You mean that in London the people go to the markets?—Yes, they go to the markets.

Mr. *Torrens.*

2836. Do you consider that the evils of overcrowding, speaking generally, are merely to be measured by the injury to bodily health?—It is a matter of impossibility to do away with overcrowding under the existing circumstances, and it is detrimental to health.

2837. Do you not think that there are other evils from overcrowding, quite apart from injury to health?—I cannot think of any just now.

Honourable Maude Stanley, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2838. You live, I believe, at 40, Dover-street, and have taken considerable interest in the dwellings of the working people in London?—Yes; I have a large acquaintance with this particular neighbourhood of the Western Improvement, and more particularly in 1877. I inquired into it, and appeared before a Committee of the House of Lords in order to get a clause passed for the protection of the displaced people.

2839. First of all, with regard to this Western Improvement scheme, which you took a great deal of trouble about. I believe that you do not think that the number of persons of the labouring class in the schedules to be displaced, according to the calculation of the Metropolitan Board of Works, is correct?—No; in the paper that was returned by the Metropolitan Board of Works to the House of Commons, they returned as displaced 1,753 persons from the Charing Cross and Tottenham-court-road and Piccadilly Improvements. That attracted my attention, knowing the neighbourhood very well, and I made a census myself of the houses. I did it by calling at each house and asking how many families there were, and how many members in a family. I made my first statement come to 6,609, or something like it. Then the Metropolitan Board of Works made a fresh census themselves, seeing that in the House of Lords I questioned their figures; I made then a second census, taking the people house by house and family by family, and my numbers came to 5,473; as this time I left out of my calculation the highest class of artizans, the Metropolitan Board of Works made a fresh census themselves, and their census came now to 5,497, a small difference of about 20 between us. This was according to the papers deposited in the Home Office, of which I have duplicates; therefore I can at any time test any statement which the Metropolitan Board of Works make with regard to the Western Improvement.

2840. The original estimate of the Metropolitan Board of Works being 1,753, their second estimate came very nearly the same as yours, which was 5,497?—Yes, as stated the other day in a Committee here.

2841. Will you give the Committee your opinion as to the necessity for re-housing the working people who would be so displaced?—The reason that I think it is so necessary for them to be rehoused in the same neighbourhood is chiefly on account of their work, the great expense it puts them to to go out to the suburbs in time, money, in railway fares, and also the expense of food when they do not live with their families. Many of them have told me that if they come out they have to spend 8*d.* a day upon their food, and if they live at home with a very few more pence the wife provides a dinner for the whole family; you have had evidence from the different working men of the great importance of dinner at home. There is one point which they have not mentioned upon which, having some knowledge of it myself, I should like to speak, and that is the great object to them of keeping their children at home. The respectable industrious working men and women in London care very much indeed about keeping their children at home with them, particularly the daughters, who lodge with them and go out to trades, and the parents think it is much better to do that rather than that they should go into lodgings, as they do in the northern manufacturing towns; the consequence is, if there are several daughters and sons, they probably continue to live together, especially the daughters; and therefore it would be the expense of many shillings in the week for railway fares if many of the family were to come in to their work. There is also great danger to girls if their parents are living in the suburbs, and the girls are working in the centre of the town; they have to come back late at night from their work, sometimes eight, nine, or ten o'clock.

Chairman—continued.

2842. Then they would have to come back in the crowded workmen's trains?—Yes, they would have to come back in the workmen's trains, or if they are kept over time, which happens often in the case of women, they would have to come back still later alone. I need hardly speak about the expenses, because so many witnesses have already spoken with regard to them, and also as to the waste of strength.

2843. Have you anything further to add; anything that we have had before, we do not want to hear again?—You have already heard about the expense it is to them to separate themselves from their family, and the disadvantage to the home of the father not being there at all.

2844. That would apply, would it not, to those workmen who are obliged to live in London on account of their work?—Yes.

2845. Some people might go out with safety, might they not?—Some might, but upon the site of the Western Improvements the workmen are chiefly employed in trades which compel them to live there; there are an immense number of tailors

Chairman—continued.

tailors and shoemakers who all work for the best West End shops, and those people must go to the shops, perhaps two or three times a day. Then the more respectable working class women do not work, but are employed by their husbands to go to and fro from the shops; that would be impossible if they were living in the suburbs.

2846. You can speak with tolerable accuracy as to the inhabitants on the Western Improvement scheme, on account of having gone from house to house and seen the families?—I have been amongst them 13 years; I have only been away from London two months in the year, and most days I have been in London, I have been there once or twice a day, and I know them intimately in their homes.

2847. Have you anything further to add about the necessity for re-housing those displaced; if not, we will go on to another point?—With regard to their position, I think that it would entirely destroy their livelihood if driven away; it is impossible for them to get into any other houses in the neighbourhood, they are so overcrowded already; and the place is so greatly overcrowded from the great demolition in Wild-street and Bedfordbury.

2848. Have the late demolitions added to the overcrowding?—Immensely; and they have raised the rents considerably.

2849. Then, in your opinion, would it not be necessary to carry out this Western Improvement by sections rather than by doing it all together?—It is the only way of doing it with any possibility of not causing very great suffering to the people, suffering even beyond the loss of work.

2850. Do you think that the restriction of the 33rd clause, as to 15 houses, might be relaxed, and a greater number of houses introduced?—I thought it was relaxed already; the Home Secretary has given leave to the Metropolitan Board of Works to pull down more than 15 houses at the present moment.

2851. Can you give the Committee any opinion as to the advantages or disadvantages of the model dwellings, which are being put up?—I think it shows how very much valued the Peabody Buildings are, and all the model dwellings, that they are so much sought after; in the case of Bedfordbury, I know people who have gone to live there, and one person I know who as soon as the walls were two feet high made an application for rooms, having always failed in other buildings, being just too late. She waited 12 months, she was the 11th on the list, and then got rooms there. I have heard that there are now about 1,200 applicants waiting to be housed in Wild-street or thereabouts; 18 people apply daily for rooms; every one of them is full, and that proves how very much they are wished for by the people who live in the neighbourhood. There are a few restrictions, but I believe it is the people who have had no experience of them who dislike the restrictions.

2852. Are there not in some buildings playgrounds for the children?—Yes, in Bedfordbury and in Wild-street there are sufficient playgrounds; I think it is a very great disadvantage in the Peabody Buildings the very small number

Chairman—continued.

of single rooms that there are in them. It was stated that the rooms were 1*s.* 11*d.* per week, but there are no rooms to be found for 1*s.* 11*d.* The lowest rent of a single room in Bedfordbury is 2*s.* 9*d.*; the rents are from 2*s.* 9*d.* to 3*s.* 3*d.* In Wild-street the lowest rent is 2*s.* 6*d.*, but out of the 345 tenements in Wild-street there are only 25 single rooms.

2853. We have had a good many questions put in the course of the proceedings of the Committee, as to the number of empty houses that there are in London, to which displaced people may go. Can you give the Committee any information on that point?—Yes; I have heard a great deal about it, but before I leave the question of single rooms may I say that in the Drury-lane improvements there are tenements for 345 families, and out of these there are 30 single rooms; only seven of them are let at 2*s.* 6*d.*, and they are on the sixth floor. There are a great number of very respectable women, widows, who live without receiving parish relief until they are 70 years of age, who are able to keep themselves in tailoring and other work, and these women when they get to be between 60 and 70 years of age would find it a very hard thing to do to mount up to the sixth floor, yet if they had rooms let to them they would be perfectly able to keep themselves away from the workhouse for many years; this is a very great drawback in the buildings. Might I also mention with reference to the costermongers, that in the Provisional Order for Great Wild-street, in the Act of 1877, it is ordered that "arrangements shall also be made for providing upon the improved area such standing room for trucks, and such store room for goods as may be suitable for the use of costermongers, occupying rooms in the said blocks." This was an order made under the Artizans' Dwellings Act; as a matter of fact, no provision has been made in the Wild-street improvements for costermongers' barrows, or for washing their vegetables, or any convenience of that kind. I know from a priest who lives close by in Sardinia-street, that he had 2,000 Roman Catholics living on that spot, which means probably that they are mostly costermongers or workers at Covent Garden. These people have only returned in a very small degree, about 30 families, because of this provision not having been carried out.

2854. Can you give us some information as to whether there are a great number of empty houses in London, or not; are there or not many empty houses in which artizans could live in London?—No, none; I have never seen an empty house in which they could live.

2855. Or in the suburbs?—I have not seen them, but I hear from all that there are a great number of houses empty there.

2856. Can you account for that?—It is because they cannot go into the suburbs; it is too expensive for them; that is what they tell me.

2857. What is your opinion of the working of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts of 1875 and 1879; do you think it has had a good effect?—It is the greatest boon to London; if it is carried out, it will probably be one of the causes which will entirely alter the condition of the working people

Chairman—continued.

of London; it is the greatest blessing of any Act that has been passed lately, because if the people have better dwellings and become more respectable, their condition will be improved morally and socially, and their health will be improved, and in every way they will be better.

2858. You have spoken about the Western Improvement Scheme; do you wish to say anything about the Tooley-street Improvement?—With regard to the Tooley-street Improvement, the only thing is in the working of the clause; the Home Secretary has power to modify restrictions, and I thought that Tooley-street was an example where the restrictions might be modified, because it is treated somewhat differently from the Western Improvement. Upon the Western Improvement it is absolutely necessary for the people to be rehoused, and there are no houses in which they can be rehoused. In Tooley-street the Metropolitan Board of Works has not built houses upon the land coloured blue, but they have shown that there are houses close by where the people could be rehoused, and in that case the Home Secretary might relax the restriction, and allow them to be made use of.

2859. Is there any other point which you wish to bring before the Committee?—There has been a great deal of talk about the cost of these artizans' dwellings in the street improvements. Sir Sydney Waterlow has shown that in the Goswell-road Buildings the rateable value of the houses has become three times what it was before. In some other cases, in Bethnal Green, for instance, where the property was of a very low nature, it has become five times the value; therefore the ratepayers will be reimbursed by having better dwellings upon their land, and the people less chargeable to the rates than if they continued in the present state, and that will pay for part of the expenses of it.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

2680. Do you yourself know many cases where persons have gone out to the suburbs, and have returned?—A great number.

2861. Is that the case in the districts which you have been speaking of, which have been affected by the Western Improvements?—Yes.

2862. Speaking generally, are the grounds upon which they have returned, the expense and the desire to keep the family together?—That is my experience.

2863. That is the chief ground?—That has been the chief ground.

2864. Have they complained that they lost their business in consequence of the difficulty of getting to London at the necessary hours;—No, because the workmen who try living in the suburbs are those who go late into work, but not tailors, shoemakers, costermongers, and others.

2865. They have been able to do that?—Yes; it has been the expense which has caused them to return. There is one man I know who has tried it twice. He was a porter at Leicester-square, and worked at the same place for 12 years. The first time he went to Battersea, he was so anxious to get a better house for the sake of his children. He was there 12 months, but he found that he could not afford it; the expense was

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

so great coming to and fro; and he came back again to London. Then his children became very sickly, and he called in a doctor, and the doctor said the only thing was to go in the country. Again he went, and stayed nine months. He took a house with a friend, and they paid 5 *s.* 9 *d.* each, but he found his wages did not meet the expenses, so he had to come back, and preferred living in two rooms in Compton-street, for 8 *s.* 6 *d.* a week. Now he is in the Wild-street Peabody Buildings, and finds himself very comfortable.

2866. I suppose we may take it that the buildings like the Peabody Buildings do not suit a lower class of workmen than those you have been referring to, that is the lower class of costermongers, sailmakers, and so on?—There are no sailmakers in that neighbourhood, but they would perfectly well suit the costermongers, if there was convenience for their barrows; they very often pay the same rent which is paid in the Peabody Buildings.

2867. Have you seen much of the houses of the Industrial Dwellings Company?—I have only seen the Waterlow Buildings.

2868. How do they compare, in your judgment, with the Peabody Buildings?—They are more cheerful and pleasant-looking, and it is, perhaps, an advantage to be divided into separate tenements, but as long as the Peabody Buildings are as they are now, with one washhouse for four or five people, there is no great disadvantage in them.

2869. Of course it is a great object when once a scheme has been allowed to proceed with it as rapidly as possible, and the difficulty is to provide, so as to satisfy the Secretary of State, dwellings for the persons displaced. We have heard that the practice of giving money to people to find lodgings for themselves has been condemned very generally; you agree, no doubt, in that?—Yes, entirely.

2870. If the Metropolitan Board of Works, or other official body, the Commissioners of Sewers, or whoever it may be, that are working out this scheme can find lodgings for the people, which will satisfy them, should that, in your judgment, be sufficient to satisfy the Secretary of State?—Yes, if the people were re-housed in the same locality.

2871. The Secretary of State would have to consider whether the people were removed too far from their work, and whether it would cost too much to come into their work, but if suitable lodgings could be found, you would be prepared to let the scheme go on?—In the same locality.

2872. "In the same locality" is rather an indefinite term. For one class of work a man may be a little further off than for another class of work?—With regard to the Pye-street improvement, it was mentioned by Mr. Goddard that it was half a mile from Soho; it is a mile and a quarter from Soho. I do not call that in the same locality.

2873. What should you say to a mile?—For some people it would be too far.

2874. Are you aware that agricultural labourers go four or five miles to their work, and return the same evening?—Yes, but they are in a very different condition.

2875. Would

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

2875. Would you go so far as to say that for a tailor to be removed a mile from his employer's shop was too far?—As a matter of fact, the tailors' shops will not give work to any tailor who lives beyond a mile; they ask, "Where do you live," and if they live beyond a mile they will not give employment to them, and with shoemakers the same. Mr. Thomas, in St. James-street, and others, will not give their work to those who live at a distance.

2876. There may be special circumstances regarding tailoring and shoemaking, but still there are certain workmen, portmanteau makers, and so forth, where there is not the least difficulty in their living a mile and a half away from their work?—There is the difficulty of dinner; if a man has an hour for his dinner, and has to walk 20 minutes to and fro for it, he cannot get his dinner at home; if it is half an hour's walk, it will take up the whole of his dinner time, and the same with regard to the children who come back for their dinner.

2877. You think that no person can be considered to be properly rehoused unless he is within a mile or a mile and a quarter?—I consider a mile is much too far in many cases.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

2878. Could you tell us, quite roughly, what you consider the general difference in rent is between the suburbs and the districts with which you are acquainted?—I suppose you get there, for 5 *s.* 6 *d.*, what you would give 8 *s.* 6 *d.* for here.

2879. Can you suggest any further pressure which could be put on private owners to put their houses in order; has anything occurred to you which could be done, which is not now done by Act of Parliament?—No; but I do not think any small efforts of private individuals will do any lasting good to the working people; it is only when you have a great Act, like the Artizans and Labourers' Dwellings Act, that you can expect any permanent good to the working classes. To renovate a few houses here and there is merely the ground work for legislation, and will not be of any essential good; it is merely the basis for others to legislate upon.

2880. We must recognise, I suppose, that in a great scheme, even like the Artizans and Labourers Act, all the efforts of private or public companies can only touch a certain number of working men living in London; may not something be done, in the meantime, in the way of pressure?—The important thing is to carry out the Artizans Dwellings Act as it is.

2881. Do you know the working of Mr. Torrens' Act?—No, I do not know anything about it, but I believe it deals well in certain cases.

2882. You do not see much advantage in further action in that direction?—No.

Viscount *Emlyn.*

2883. With regard to the rents of the new buildings, are they much higher than the people would have paid for the same amount of accommodation in the old buildings?—No; rather lower.

2884. We were told by some other witness to-day that the artizans should be allowed to have

Mr. *Torrens.*

their houses at a less rent than the market value; would that be desirable?—Very undesirable.

2885. For the sake of the artizans themselves?—Yes; for his own proper spirit; he should not be receiving charity.

2886. Do you think that would be the feeling of the artizan class generally?—They would not desire it, certainly not.

2887. On whom would you devolve the duty of rebuilding where demolition takes place; on what authority, a central authority or a local authority?—Do you mean under the Artizans Dwellings Act or the Street Improvement Act.

2888. Either, or both?—I should leave it to private enterprise.

2889. Should the authority be bound to let or sell the sites?—Yes.

2890. Have you considered at all whether any more circumscribed authority, the corporation or the vestry, could do a great deal more of the work, which is found difficult for the Metropolitan Board of Works to do?—I should be very sorry to have it in the hands of the vestry.

2891. Are you aware that in the district to which you have given so much attention a great number of houses have been put in thorough repair by the operation of the vestry?—No, I am not aware of it.

2892. And that some have been pulled down, and the sites let for rebuilding by the vestry?—No.

2893. It has been done by the Board, which is equivalent to the vestry?—No, I am not aware of it. I have seen no change there.

2894. No adequate change?—No.

2895. Has your attention been called to the efforts made by large employers in that region to replace the bad dwellings with better ones at their own expense?—To a very small extent. Messrs. Crosse & Blackwell have built a few houses. That is all.

2896. Are you aware what has been done by Coombe Delafield's Brewery in the neighbourhood of Newcastle-street?—No.

2897. Do you know what has been done by Messrs. Steddall & Company?—No.

Mr. *Rankin.*

2898. Can you tell the Committee if there are many persons in your district who are out of employment at the present time?—No; I should think it was a good year.

2899. Can you tell me whether there are many houses in the district with which you are acquainted which are in an insanitary condition?—Newport Market, though it is a low neighbourhood, is not insanitary, because there are very few deaths there, and if there is a case of small-pox or scarlet fever, it rarely spreads beyond the room in which it is, though the people occupy the same staircase, and several people are in one house; therefore I do not think it is an insanitary condition.

2900. Is that one of the neighbourhoods marked to come down?—Yes, that is to be pulled down.

2901. In your opinion it is unnecessary that it should be demolished?—It is not unnecessary, for I wish much for the new street.

Mr. *Rankin*—continued.

2902. Can you tell me the usual rent for single rooms in your district?—The lowest is 2 *s.* 6 *d.*; the usual rent is 3 *s.*

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

2903. I understand from you that, taking into consideration the heavy expense which must fall upon the ratepayers of London, in consequence of replacing these people who are displaced, in the cleared areas, you still think that it would be preferable to do that rather than to send them into the suburbs?—You cannot send them into the suburbs, because they will not go; you can only send them into their own neighbourhoods to overcrowd them.

2904. But as a matter of fact, they have gone largely into the suburbs, have they not?—Not from that neighbourhood.

2905. But from London generally, have they not?—I am only speaking of the site of the Western improvement.

2906. I suppose you would admit that in the suburbs they get great advantages for their children, in the way of fresher air, and more room and space?—Of course it is better to be in the fresh air, but if you cannot pay for it you cannot have fresh air.

2907. Have you had any experience of any the dwellings which have been improved and supervised by private individuals?—I have four houses of my own in this district, which I have had for a few years.

2908. Have you improved them?—Yes, and I have had about 20 tenants.

2909. Were they very bad before you took them in hand?—Two of them were in a very bad condition indeed.

2910. Do you mean that they were in an insanitary condition?—In a very filthy condition.

2911. And had the people living in them preferred those houses to the better dwellings, which have been erected, the model dwellings?—They had had no opportunity of going into better dwellings.

2912. Was that because they could not get in?—They were not there; they have only lately come there; they have only been opened a short time in the neighbourhood. They are the first that we have had in the neighbourhood; those are the Bedfordbury and Wild-street Buildings.

2913. As soon as the buildings were put up, and ready to receive tenants, they were filled, I suppose?—They were immediately filled.

2914. And I suppose these buildings which you yourself supervise are much smaller than the model dwellings, common street houses?—Yes.

2915. Could you tell us as to the preference which the working classes who go into the model dwellings have; do they prefer the lower rather than the higher storeys, or do they prefer the higher storeys?—I cannot tell you that; I should think they would prefer the lower ones, because there are fewer stairs to walk up.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

2916. You spoke of an area where the increased value of the improved houses has been five times that of the old houses?—Yes.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

2917. Where were those houses?—In Bethnal Green.

2918. From where did you derive the figures?—From the secretary of the Waterlow Company Buildings.

2919. You are not aware whether the figures have been before this Committee?—I think not.

2920. Could you give me the exact site of the Bethnal Green improvement?—No, I cannot, but I can get it for you.

2921. I think there was another case that you mentioned; where was that?—Going off the Goswell-road.

2922. Are the buildings erected by Sir Sydney Waterlow's Company?—Yes.

2923. Those buildings are for a superior class of people, are they not, to the people who have been displaced?—I do not know; they are the same sort of rents as the other Waterlow Buildings.

2924. The sites were cleared by private enterprise, were they not?—I cannot tell you how that is. I know that the rateable value of the property in the Goswell-road is three times what it was before, and that in Bethnal Green five times.

2925. You spoke of the Act of 1875 as being a great blessing; do you know any sites that have been or are about to be cleared under that Act?—No, I know the sites that have been cleared in Bedfordbury and Wild-street.

2926. Did you know the houses before the sites were cleared?—Yes, I knew the neighbourhood before, not as particularly as I knew the Newport Market site, but I did know it.

2927. Are there a great many sites, in your opinion, in London which should be cleared under that Act?—I cannot tell; I do not know all London.

2928. Do you know personally many spots that ought to be cleared?—All the back of Crown-street should be cleared. The Metropolitan Board of Works have taken part; their lines of deviation do not go sufficiently far back.

2929. Is that in the Western improvement?—Yes.

2930. Take the district which you know best; do you think that if the new street was not to be made that that district should be dealt with under the Artizans Dwellings Act?—I think it hardly could, because it is not insanitary as far as deaths and illness go, though I think the street will be a very great advantage; in the case of rehousing the people so much is done under the Artizans Dwellings Act for people who are in an insanitary condition; and here most of the people are industrious working people; the people dealt with in the Artizans Dwellings Act are generally of a lower class; indeed, I may say that most of the 5,700 people living here are a respectable class of workpeople, and it would be very hard upon them that for the sake of the improvement of the town they should be turned away from their living, when the people who live in insanitary places, the lowest of all, are provided for, and that you should not give the same advantage to the one as is given to the other.

2931. In fact their houses are not destroyed because they are insanitary, but because they are wanted for the improvement?—Yes.

2932. In

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

2932. In answer to one of the honourable Members, I think you said that you had got some property in this locality?—Yes.

2933. Am I right in saying that you have three houses, one at No. 12, Lichfield-street?—Yes.

2934. Another at No. 5, Porter-street?—Yes.

2935. And another at No. 9, Market-street?—Yes, in regard to which the Metropolitan Board of Works are now my landlords.

2936. Was not No. 12, Lichfield-street, purchased for the establishment of a penny bank?—Yes.

2937. What was the rent that you used to receive for that house, including the rent of the shop. I think you received 125*l.* 6*s.* per annum; is not that so?—No.

2938. I have it here from your own figures, 125*l.* 6*s.*, including 35*l.* per annum for the shop from the bank?—£.35 I received from the shop from the bank.

2939. And the rest you received from the lodgers?—What was not from the bank was from the lodgers.

2940. Deducting the ground rent and taxes, what is the net rental?—£. 75 a year.

2941. You give 75*l.* a year?—Yes.

2942. And you receive 125*l.*?—No; the rates and taxes were 20*l.*

2943. That leaves a profit of 26*l.* 11*s.*?—Perhaps; but you must always reckon that there is one room empty all through the year, on account of people who do not pay rent.

2944. Then you received 5*s.* or 6*s.* a week per room, or something of that kind?—It varied, sometimes they were 3*s.*

2945. Perhaps you would let me put it in this. I see one front kitchen was 3*s.*; that is the only one?—Yes.

2946. Now, as to No. 9, Market-street, is not that held at 40*l.*?—Yes.

2947. And 5, Porter-street, 50*l.*?—Yes.

2947*. I understand the gross rental that you receive is 201*l.* 10*s.*; paying 90*l.*?—No; nothing of the sort.

2948. No. 9, Market-street, brings 88*l.* 8*s.*; and No. 5, Porter-street, 113*l.* 2*s.*?—No. 5, Porter-street, I have the rent that I received for various years; it was about 81*l.*, a year; it varied according to whether the people were there or not.

2949. Was your application for compensation based upon what you tell us?—Upon the rents for the rooms, for the rents that I should receive if they were always occupied; but you put against that, that you do not always receive the rents.

2950. Do you know that the rents that you obtain are from 75 to 100 per cent. more than those in the Peabody Buildings?—I know that they are higher.

2951. Then if Peabody Buildings were erected there, they would be rather a benefit to the working classes?—Of course they would; and they would have the advantage of having better tenants. My object in taking the houses was to try what I could do to make people better who were in a bad condition. Many of my efforts were failures, and the people that I thought I could put in a better condition, by putting them into decent houses, have turned out failures, as you may know often happens; so that I have been without rents.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

2952. Were you under covenants to repair, and to do painting, &c., when you took the houses?—No, I do not think so.

2953. Do you administer the property yourself, or have you an agent to look after it?—I administer it partly myself.

2954. Have you been in the houses lately?—Yes; they are in a very bad state; it is impossible to do anything; it is impossible to put locks to doors, because people break into them on account of the condition of the neighbourhood.

2955. Then that does not agree with an answer you gave to an honorable Member, that none of these were in an insanitary state?—They are not insanitary, because there is no illness about them.

2956. A house may be insanitary, surely, where there is no illness; but I understand that the houses in Porter-street and Market-street are both very bad, especially the one in Market-street, and that one of the conveniences absolutely necessary in the house now is useless, and the door has been nailed up for some considerable period?—No, it is not the case.

2957. You deny it?—I deny that; there were two, and one was locked up because it was found it was not efficient. You say there was none.

2958. There was one of them which was locked up?—Because I was advised by the sanitary inspector to lock it up.

2959. Have you any objection to put in a Paper showing the names of the various tenants in your three houses, the rents they pay, and the accommodation they get for these rents?—Not the slightest objection. "No. 12, Lichfield-street, third-floor front, Mrs. Lear, rent 4*s.* 6*d.*; third-floor back, furnished, Haworth, rent 5*s.*; second-floor, two rooms, Shelly, rent 8*s.* 6*d.*; first-floor, two rooms, Kirkham, rent 8*s.* 6*d.*; back parlour, Childs, rent 3*s.* 6*d.*; shop, unlet; kitchen, Palmley, rent 3*s.*" Then, "No. 5, Porter-street, third-floor, three rooms, Vile, rent 8*s.*; second-floor front, Grale, rent 6*s.*; second floor back, Sullivan, rent 4*s.*; first-floor front, Ingleson, rent 6*s.*; first-floor back, unlet; front parlour, Grove, 6*s.*; back parlour, two rooms, Brittain, 4*s.*" Then, "No. 9, Market-street, third-floor front, Martin, 3*s.* 6*d.*; third-floor back, unlet; second-floor front, Bonny, 5*s.*; second-floor back, Collier, no rent; first-floor front, Pugh, 5*s.*; first-floor back, 3*s.*; shop, tenants are the Metropolitan Board, at a rent of 10*s.* a-week."

2960. You said that the artizans were chiefly tailors and shoemakers in the Western Improvement; was it from your own investigation that you said so?—I have a paper which specifies exactly how many there are of each.

2661. Was that paper checked by anybody after you went over it?—No, it was not checked by anybody.

2962. It is entirely your own?—Yes.

2963. Do you know anything about the Gray's Inn-lane improvement?—Nothing.

2964. You have been paying a good deal of attention to the 33rd section. Having seen the

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

state of affairs, can you tell us whether it is possible to carry out any improvement with that 33rd section, without any modification whatever?—I do not know; modifications may be necessary in some small details, but now that the Home Secretary has given the Metropolitan Board of Works leave to pull down on the lands coloured blue and red upon your map, and also allowed you to remove the people who are on that land to Old Pye-street, Westminster, it will give you a basis to go upon, and this land coloured blue is sufficient to make a block of buildings. You would not require to use it for anything else, because it is just the bit which leaves a frontage to the large street, therefore that makes a beginning; they do not intend to allow you to do anything more until you have erected the buildings upon the land coloured blue, but it makes a beginning for the whole scheme.

2965. You do approve of some modification then; you approve of that?—Yes, I am extremely anxious for the street; there must be some modification, and that is a modification; some of the people will suffer, but it must be so.

2966. I understood you to say that you also approved of some modification as regards Tooley-street?—Yes.

2967. And if that is applicable for two, it might be applicable for all, now that the 33rd section is stopping improvements?—I think each scheme must be judged upon its own merits, and according to the necessities of the neighbourhood; in Tooley-street the reason for my not objecting is that the buildings are ready for the people to go into, and the superintendent told me they were taking them in there daily.

2968. I understand you agree that if the Metropolitan Board of Works can show that there is room for these working classes elsewhere, there might be still further modification?—Not elsewhere; in the same locality.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

2969. Old Pye-street is not near enough?—No, I do not think it near enough; but as there must be a beginning, these people must suffer.

2970. Then, practically, you think that an improvement which was very advisable would have been impossible if we had not a slight modification given us?—I think it would have been impossible.

2971. You told me that you did not know anything of the Gray's Inn-lane Improvement?—No, I know nothing about it. I also wish to add that the people turned out from the land coloured blue are said to number, by the Metropolitan Board of Works, 346 persons; as a matter of fact, there are 500 persons disturbed, and of course if 100 here and 100 there is taken off the numbers to be accommodated, it will tell very much upon the total.

2972. Is that 500 within the Act of Parliament or not; there was a schedule?—Yes, in the schedules, they are.

2973. Is that in the schedule?—Yes, they are, and I have duplicates of it.

2974. We only move a certain number in that case; you take those within the line of deviation, and we take those really dispossesed?—I am talking of this land coloured blue, for which you had power given by the Home Secretary in December 1880, to pull down the houses, and which you intend to do next August.

2975. Those are the numbers we have got from our officers?—Then they are erroneous.

Chairman.

2976. Did you hear how the mistake was made of there only being 1,760 instead of 5,400?—The Metropolitan Board of Works stated that they had not given particular directions to their clerks as to how they were to take the number, and it had been done in a haphazard sort of way.

Miss Octavia Hill, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2977. I believe you have paid considerable attention to the housing of the poor in London?—Yes.

2978. In what part of London are the houses which have been specially under your charge?—They have been scattered a good deal; some in Marylebone, Whitechapel, St. Pancras, Chelsea, Drury-lane, Kensington, and Lambeth; I think that is all.

2979. How long has your attention been specially turned to this matter?—I have had houses under my care for 17 years.

2980. I believe your particular plan of working has been the improvement of individual houses?—Yes, I think my particular plan has been that of improving tenants in old houses, but during the course of years in which I have been engaged in the work a good many tenants have much improved, and when both tenants and houses had improved, as far as I could carry them with the old buildings, I have had several houses rebuilt.

Chairman—continued.

2981. You have had a good deal of experience in purchasing old houses for the purpose of re-building?—Yes; I have in purchasing houses which I have afterwards rebuilt.

2982. You do not buy them for the express purpose, but you afterwards re-build them?—Yes.

2983. What is your experience as to the pecuniary result of that?—Of course many of my undertakings are on a very small scale; beginning with the idea of individual work amongst the tenants, I have only bought in small quantities, and they are not to be compared with any operations of large building societies; but my experience with reference to re-building is that it can be done to pay, even under very difficult circumstances, if sufficient attention is paid to the details of the scheme. I have heard it stated again and again that houses cannot really be made to pay when the ground rent has been more than 3*d.* a foot. I have been looking over some of the accounts of the

Chairman—continued.

the courts re-built, and I find we have been paying in some of the courts 4 per cent. on both ground and buildings, when the ground-rent practically amounts to 9*d.* a foot.

2984. That is in small two-storey houses?—No, we have had exceedingly difficult problems before us, and the most difficult that I ever had was where the houses contained 10 rooms; there was a basement and ground-floor, and three storeys above that, and a very narrow court where we had no oportunity of bringing in any fresh land, or of re-arranging it to any advantage; in fact, we were obliged to cover less space, because in this narrow court all the back yards almost have been built over, so that the open space in the yards at the back of the houses for 10 families was in some cases only four feet square, so entirely had the back yards been built over. My problem was to rebuild so as to pay, and that has been a very difficult one, and we have only barely touched 4 per cent., but we have touched 4 per cent.

2985. In what part of London is that?—In Marylebone.

2986. What court or street?—The court is called Barrett's-court, and the particular buildings are called Sarsden-buildings.

2987. Do you know if any other persons have taken up the same kind of work in the same way?—A very large number of people have been co-operating; very few of the houses I speak of are really mine. And during the last few years a great many people have taken up such work to a great extent independently.

2988. Could you tell us the amount of capital invested in that sort of thing, to your knowledge?—I am afraid I do not remember, but I think when I left England four years ago, it was 60,000 *l.* worth that I handed over. A good deal of it is freehold, and that means a good deal of capital with very few tenants. When we have leaseholds we have very many tenants and very little capital.

2989. Have you observed the habits of those people, in your intercourse with them?—Yes.

2990. Will you give us your views as to how far suburban dwellings are likely to meet the wants of the working classes?—I should hope for a good deal from the suburban dwellings, for the increased population, but as far as I have observed, there will be as much need for as many dwellings in the central part of London as there are now. My whole effort has been to keep the people in these courts, for the sole object of keeping them in the centre, partly because I do see that their work enormously depends upon it.

2991. Will you give us the reasons which have led you to that conclusion?—I know and believe that a great deal depends on the class and on the ages of family; where you have a mechanic who is the sole bread-winner, he can get out of town pretty well, if he can get good workmen's trains, and his family all profit by it; but where, as in the lower classes of labour, with which I have mainly to do, several members of the family are more or less employed, then the workmen's trains do not fit at all; both boys and girls are at work, and do not live at home, their hours do not often correspond; the train fares mount up, and the

Chairman—continued.

breaking up of the family for meals is very much more serious.

2992. What sort of employment are the people engaged in that you talk of?—They are people employed in all kinds of trades, but their living out of town without loss depends upon the age of the family, when they are small they can go away; the largest number of my tenants are poor Irish bricklayers' labourers.

2993. What kind of wages do they earn?—A labourer, if he is in full work, is earning 24 *s.* a week; but for a part of the year he is not in work, and the wages of a great many of my people fall very much below that; the people who feel most about moving out of town are, as Miss Stanley said, the tailors and the shoemakers; they work for the shops in Bond-street, Regent-street, and Oxford-street, and so on, and we are just opening a block of buildings near there, and we have had applications from people living in the suburbs and working in the town, who say the expense is great going backwards and forwards.

2994. They all want to come back again?—They have applied to come back.

2995. Is that any considerable number?—Yes, it is a good many, I think, considering that we have not taken means of making it known.

2996. You are aware of the difficulties that there are in carrying out the Artizans' Dwellings Improvement Act, are you not?—Yes.

2997. Do you approve of the Act?—Yes.

2998. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee as to the way in which it might be amended or carried out better than it has been?—No; I can only say that the whole question depends on detail; none of the things that I have have had to do with would have paid if it had not been for carefully watching the expenses and the receipts.

2999. Have you had any difficulty in gathering your rents?—No, we get a very large proportion of our rents.

3000. Do you get them weekly?—Yes.

3001. In advance?—No, not in advance.

3002. You are distinctly of opinion that the difficulty is not one of rental?—Yes, the difficulty of accommodating the poor in improved dwellings is not primarily one of rental. It seems to me that one great difficulty that has been before the people who have been interested in the Artizans' Dwellings Act is that they want to take too many steps at once; they want to move the very lowest class of the poor out of, we will say, damp underground cellars, where a large number of them have been living in one room, at once into an ideal working man's home. Now I grant that that problem is very difficult; but supposing they take the two steps separately, and be satisfied for the moment to build clean, light, substantial, dry rooms above ground, and instead of building them in suites, build them, as it is very easy to do, opening form a little lobby, from which four rooms enter, instead of making any of them passage rooms; and they can let either one, two, three, or four rooms, as the people require; and whenever the standard of working people is raised higher they can take more rooms.

3003. You could educate them in that way,

Chairman—continued.

and let the building, and give them the benefit of it; they can be let in single rooms?—I can see no harm, as a temporary measure, in putting a man and wife and quite small children in a single room. In most of the new model buildings you will only find a few single rooms; and the idea is that these shall be let to widows, or to single people, and there are no large single rooms; the rent by room in the improved dwellings is lower than that in the neighbourhood; therefore, if those rooms were so built that they were separable, you could take in your people at once and get a high rental; I am longing for some of the dwelling companies to take up the idea, and to build the rooms separable; I know why they will not do it.

3004. Why will they not do it?—Because the larger proportion of them would feel the difficulty of collecting their rents; now the demand is great for their rooms, and they have much less troublesome tenants.

3005. But you think it would pay as well?—If any scheme came under my notice, and I could be in authority for a few weeks, so as to undertake the arrangement under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, that is what I should do; I should build separable rooms with separate entrances, and let the families into them.

Monday, 3rd April 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Bryce.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Assheton Cross.
Viscount Emlyn.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Torrens.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

The Honourable Miss MAUDE STANLEY, re-called; and further Examined.

Chairman.

3006. I BELIEVE you wish to give a little explanation with regard to Question 2947*, put to you on the last occasion by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works: "I understand the gross rental you receive is 201 *l.* 10 *s.*, paying 90 *l.*? (*A.*) No, nothing of the sort."?—The actual rental I have received for the house, No. 5, Porter-street, has been an average of 83 *l.* a year, and the expenses out of that have been: rent, 50 *l.*; rates and taxes, 14 *l.*; insurance, 1 *l.*, and rent collecting, 5 per cent.; that has brought

Chairman—continued.

out this result, that I have spent 14 *l.* over what I have received in the course of three years. This does not represent the real value of the house, because in this case I have kept one room unlet for purposes of my own in the neighbourhood; and at various times I have thought fit to allow tenants to remain in the house, in case of sickness, without paying any rent, which would have made it come higher than it does.

3007. I believe you wish to put in that Paper?—Yes (*handing in the same*).

The Reverend SAMUEL AUGUSTUS BARNETT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3008. WHERE do you live?—At St. Jude's Vicarage, Whitechapel.

3009. How long have you been in that parish?—Over nine years.

3010. Is part of that parish affected by schemes under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—A very large part of it indeed.

3011. Have you had special opportunities of judging of the condition of the people?—Yes, both as a guardian and member of the Charity Organisation Committee, and in some way from being connected with the management of the houses in the neighbourhood.

3012. What class of people inhabit the neighbourhood?—The very lowest possible class.

3013. What sort of occupations have they?—Mostly street occupations; if they are tradesmen at all they are only tradesmen selling in the street; tailors selling in the street, and so on.

3014. Is there a great deal of selling in the street in that neighbourhood?—Yes, nearly the whole population live by the street, I suppose.

3015. In fact, a great part of the streets are hardly passable in consequence of people selling?—That is so, sometimes.

3016. Is there a considerable difference between the nightly lodgers of the common lodging houses and those occupying single rooms?—Yes, a great difference.

3017. Will you explain that?—The nightly

Chairman—continued.

lodgers are very largely the evil-doers. Casual dock labourers, and drunkards, and people without the means of living; the occupants of single rooms are decent working people.

3018. You do not class all the dock labourers as amongst the evil-doers, do you?—No, the unmarried dock labourers.

3019. What kind of employment do the occupiers of the single rooms follow?—They are hawkers; if they make anything they sell what they make in the neighbourhood.

3020. Is their work dependent on the locality in which they live?—Generally, but not entirely; they sell much more easily in the City; but they go long distances.

3021. Are they costermongers?—No, hawkers; there are very few costermongers; they carry things in their hands.

3022. What wages do these men, on an average, earn?—Under 20 *s.* Some weeks they earn a great deal, and some weeks very little; but under 20 *s.*, on the average.

3023. What kind of rent have they to pay?—The lowest rent for a single room would be 2 *s.* 9 *d.*

3024. Is that furnished?—Unfurnished.

3025. What do they have to pay for a furnished room?—Four shillings and sixpence.

3026. For a single room?—Yes.

3027. What do they pay for nightly lodgings?—Threepence

Chairman—continued.

—Threepence or 4 *d.* a night for single men or women.

3028. Are the nightly lodgings in registered houses?—Yes.

3029. What time do they admit them in the evening?—At any time in registered lodgings.

3030. What time do they turn them out in the morning?—At any time; they are quite free.

3031. You say their work is not altogether dependent on the locality, but are there any reasons for making it necessary that they should live in the neighbourhood?—Yes, they are largely communists; that is if one man earns more one day, he shares it with a neighbour who earns little, so that they could not afford to separate.

3032. Is that a common practice?—Quite a common practice; I do not say that it is done according to any rule; but, as a matter of fact, if a man does well one day, he helps his neighbour, and they get through the bad times by those means.

3033. That is the constant practice?—Yes, they help one another largely. Nothing surprises one more than the way in which the poor help the poor.

3034. It is not according to any rule?—No.

3035. A man who is helped at one time will feel bound to help others at another time?—When his good turn comes.

3036. Is that engagement faithfully kept?—Very faithfully kept, though there are no rules or contract; that is the only way in which I can account for the fact that in bad times they do get on, and one has every now and then a proof of it, one poor family helping another poor family. Then there is a great love for the place; there is a very strong clan feeling; the people hold together very much. There is a great deal of migration within a certain distance, but there are two or three clans in the neighbourhood, keeping together through thick and thin.

3037. What is the worst part of your neighbourhood?—Under the Goulston-street scheme, Castle-alley; and under the Flower-and-Dean-street scheme, New-court, George-yard.

3038. What is the state of health and morals in those particular parts?—As bad as one can describe; they were very seldom free from disease; there were all kinds of little fevers about, and other diseases; and, morally, the state was too horrible to think of; girls have got ruined there time after time; the children never went regularly to school, and drunkenness was as bad as it could be upon those two spots.

3039. How did those facts come to your knowledge?—As a member of the board of guardians. It came to my knowledge from the people requiring accommodation in the house, or requiring a doctor.

3040. Was any effort made for the improvement of the district before the passing of the Artizans' Dwellings' Act?—Yes; we made two or three representations to the vestry under Torrens' Act, and as a result of our representation, the case went before the vestry, but it ended in absolutely nothing; a little whitewash, and it was left as bad as ever.

Chairman—continued.

3041. What has been done upon the passing of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts?—In the board of guardians, I brought forward a resolution asking the guardians to make a representation as 12 ratepayers; and they did so immediately after the passing of the Act.

3042. When did the demolition under that Act begin?—It was not till a year ago that anything really commenced.

3043. Then there were five years between this time of the representations and the demolition?—Yes.

3044. What became of the houses in the meantime?—They gradually grew worse; because the landlords refused to do anything, and the tenants would not go, because they wanted compensation; on the whole, things got worse.

3045. In your opinion, in the administration of the Acts, would it not be wise that reconstruction should take place as rapidly as possible?—Certainly.

3046. How many houses have been pulled down?—Within the last year, a good number.

3047. Have any been reconstructed yet?—None whatever.

3048. Were the houses that were pulled down, all of the worst description?—No, some fairly built houses have been pulled down.

3049. Are they included in the scheme?—They are included in the scheme.

3050. That is for the sake, I suppose, of a rearrangement?—Yes, but they were not of the worst description themselves.

3051. You have given me a note about George-yard; have you anything to say as to that?—There were three houses destroyed early last year in George-yard, certainly not of the worst description; and it puzzles one why they should be pulled down, while some of the neighbouring houses which are much worse are allowed to be occupied.

3052. Then that might be remedied by proper administration?—Yes.

3053. Has that plot been let to the Peabody trustees?—No, nothing has been let yet; an offer was made for that particular site by a man I know.

3054. Is that the Flower-and-Dean-street scheme?—Yes.

3055. Is the compensation given to the tenants under that Act unsatisfactory?—Very unsatisfactory; the compensation is given so long before they leave. Now many of the tenants still occupying condemned houses have received compensation.

3056. The money has gone?—Yes, the money has gone, and when the time of moving comes, the hardship will be as great as ever.

3057. Do you think that if you pay tenants 2 *l.* or 3 *l.* when they left, you ought to let them find their own places to go to, or ought there to be reconstruction?—There ought to be reconstruction in the neighbourhood.

3058. For the whole number?—Possibly not for the whole, but for the larger proportion in my particular part.

3059. Can you give the Committee any notion of what proportion of the people there ought to be rehoused, in your particular part?—Very nearly all.

3060. What

Chairman—continued.

3060. What class of people do you think should be allowed to go away?—Some of the nightly lodgers.

3061. Do you think they would be able to find some kind of work elsewhere?—Yes, they come to London to work for a month or two, and they might as well go somewhere else.

3062. Do you know of any excessive compensation being awarded to owners?—One fact came out in public. In Castle-alley, Mr. Rodwell's award was 4,874 *l.*; it was taken before a jury, and the jury awarded 2,700 *l.*

3063. What was the amount in the provisional award?—£. 3,100.

3064. What has been done by voluntary efforts in your neighbourhood?—One block of buildings has been built by the Board, and some blocks of houses bought and improved.

3065. Have they done any good?—An immense deal of good.

3066. Do they pay?—Some of them pay very well; one particular property does not pay as well as the other, but, as a rule, it is an average of four per cent. all the way through.

3067. What class of people live in the new buildings and the improved houses?—The same people who lived in the single rooms before.

3068. The hawkers?—Yes.

3069. They have moved?—Yes, I have a list of the people, giving their trades, which I will hand in. (*The same was handed in.*)

3070. Those were built by Mr. Crowder?—Yes.

3071. Who is Mr. Crowder?—A friend of mine.

3072. I have two more Papers here, one from Wentworth-street; what does that refer to?—They are houses that have been bought and improved.

3073. By whom?—Lord Pembroke bought those. (*Papers were handed in.*)

3074. Are there any rules as to the occupation of the improved dwellings?—No restrictive rules, as long as the tenants are fairly decent livers.

3075. What is the system of management?—A lady collector collects the rents twice a week.

3076. That is the lady we met when we went there, I suppose?—Yes.

3077. Is there any difficulty in getting the rents?—Not as a rule; the rents are paid well upon the whole.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3078. Are they paid in advance?—No, not as a rule.

Chairman.

3079. Are the houses popular?—Yes, very popular.

3080. Why cannot the plan be extended?—On account of the difficulty in getting houses; we cannot buy any further.

3081. Have you any of the Peabody buildings in your district?—Not in my district, but there are not very far off on the south side of Whitechapel parish.

3082. Have you any Waterloo buildings?—Not in my parish.

Chairman—continued.

3083. Would the Peabody buildings meet the wants of the people you speak of?—No.

3084. Will you explain why?—One rule is they must give a reference to a regular employer, and my people have no regular employer; secondly, women may not take in washing, and the women must supplement their earnings by taking in washing if necessary.

3085. Do you object to the plan of these industrial dwellings, provided those two rules were altered?—I like the plan of the industrial dwellings.

3086. You think it would be wise to erect buildings of that kind?—Yes.

3087. Provided the Peabody rules were altered in those two respects?—Yes; I prefer the new buildings to the improved dwellings in our own parish.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3088. When did he build them?—Somewhat about seven or eight years ago.

Chairman.

3089. In this Paper that you have given us on Lord Pembroke's houses and improved dwellings, under the head of occupation, there is one here: "Daniels, hawker; wife, crotchet work for shops; daughter, cigar factory; daughter, umbrella factory; family, eight; room, one; rent, 3*s.* 6*d*?"—It practically is two rooms; it goes right through the house.

3090. Is there any division?—It is a kind of division. Part of the family has removed. We have had one or two difficulties about them, and the girls are made to lodge out.

3091. You would not consider that a satisfactory state of things?—No; but if you do not put them in improved dwellings they are in a much worse condition in other houses.

3092. Here is "Donovan, cocoa-nut fibre worker; wife hawks." In that case there are 10 in two rooms; is that satisfactory?—As satisfactory as it can be; the man is a hard-working man.

3093. Here is "Warrington, blind man, sings; wife hawks occasionally; seven in family." Seven in family, living in one room; is that satisfactory?—It is not what one wants; it is better than living as they did before, in a hovel. Then gradually, as they come under our care, we induce them to take two rooms, and we can get the elder girls out.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3094. In that case of Daniels, I suppose the whole family earnings would be considerable?—It was very irregular work, and there is a good deal of poverty there.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3095. Did they make any partition at all in the room?—Yes, at night. The state of the poor is not satisfactory.

3096. Still you think they are improving from what they were?—It was horrible in the other rooms, where there was no privacy of any kind.

Chairman.

3097. I gather from you that it would be wise in these unhealthy areas, under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, not to pull down the houses until the land is sold?—I should not. If that block of land which came under the scheme in my parish had been put in my hands, I should have pulled down some of the places at once and left some of the better houses, and worked the scheme up gradually. I should not have waited to clear the whole plot.

3098. Do you approve of the Acts?—Yes, very much.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3099. With reference to your last answer but one; I presume, though you would not pull down all the houses, but make use of them, you would take care that no new binding arrangements should be made which would afterwards hamper the Metropolitan Board of Works?—Quite so.

3100. No new arrangements should be made after the provisional award has been made?—No. The property having come into the hands of the purchaser, the purchaser should be free to destroy gradually, and keep some of the better houses standing for ten or twelve years possibly.

3101. With respect to the hawkers that you mentioned, they of course could not live out in the suburbs?—Not without great hardship, it seems to me, and the market porters must live near.

3102. Would the hardship arise upon the ground of expense or on account of the difficulty of getting to their work?—Yes, and also because they would be separated from their friends.

3103. There are three grounds of hardship, then?—Yes.

3104. Have you had any experience of persons who have gone out into the suburbs and then come back again?—No, not in my own parish.

3105. I gather from your evidence that very few from your district have gone into the suburbs?—Very few indeed, I should think.

3106. You have referred to the working under Mr. Torrens's Act, and have said that several representations were made under that Act; but then there came a stoppage?—Yes.

3107. To what cause do you attribute the stoppage?—I suppose the vestry could not find it in their hearts to condemn property without compensation.

3108. Do you suppose that really the vestry had any interest in the property?—I do not think they had in that property, but there was a fellow feeling. We made three or four representations, and Dr. Liddle, the medical officer, supported us, but nothing was done.

3109. Did the surveyor to their body report the property, and the state of the buildings?—I should say so.

3110. Then it was in the vestry that the stoppage arose?—Yes, it was impossible to rebuild upon the site; it was too narrow.

3111. Then you have strongly advocated reconstruction upon these cleared areas; and I rather gathered that the kind of buildings you would wish to construct would be something like these houses that have been built by Mr. Crowder,

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

and other private individuals?—Yes, taking in single families in one room.

3112. Would those houses, more than the Peabody buildings, be suited to the class of hawkers, costermongers, and dock labourers?—Yes.

3113. And I think your experience of the buildings built by private persons is, that some little dividend might be expected?—Our experience is so, and Mr. Crowder himself says that he has gained 4½ per cent. ever since upon the outlay; 2 *s.* 9 *d.* is his cheapest room.

3114. What does he charge for two rooms?—He makes a reduction; 4 *s.* 6 *d.*

Mr. *Cropper.*

3115. You were speaking of dock labourers; are those a class of men who are called permanent labourers?—No, they are not permanent; they go down every morning, and get called.

3116. Then there are always too many of them?—Yes, there are too many of them.

3117. Amongst them, is it common to help each other?—Yes, the whole lot help one another.

3118. Since the houses were pulled down, and the blank places left, I suppose your population is rather less than it was?—Yes.

3119. Do you find any harm in that; is there any hardship done; are there not as many people there as are wanted for the work that has to be done?—I daresay there is at the docks.

3120. Altogether, do you consider that there is a lack of workpeople for the demand for workpeople in that part?—No, I should not say so, because I have not noticed it.

3121. Therefore a great many have gone away?—I do not think they have gone far off; I have not lost sight of any that I know; I still know them; they find location somewhere near.

3122. Have they permanently settled themselves in small houses?—Yes, somewhere near where other people have moved out.

3123. If the cleared spots could not be recovered with workmen's houses, what harm would be done?—A number of people who have to live near London would suffer some kind of hardship.

3124. It seems to me, by what you say, that there are 100 people waiting to do work, for which, perhaps, only 75 are really required, the odd 25 being, as it were, helped by the others when they cannot get sufficient to do?—Yes.

3125. It must be better for your population if the number were rather fewer?—But you do not abolish them, they still exist.

3126. It is like the overcrowding in Ireland; they go where they are wanted?—They are not wanted anywhere, except in this district; round the markets and the docks.

3127. From what you say, they are hardly wanted in the markets; then what would you do with them?—Removing them does not abolish them.

3128. Keeping them there makes the grievance permanent?—But you cannot find any other work for them, except such work as is possible in the City, hawking, or about the markets and the docks; these people must get that kind of work; they

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

they are such a low class, physically and educationally, that they are not fit for anything else.

3129. Is it necessary that they should remain so?—You may educate the next generation, but this generation you cannot.

3130. But if you keep them there, the next generation will be as bad?—Not if you keep them in better houses.

3131. But they work in the same low place?—Our example proves that getting exactly the same people into improved dwellings, they are much better workpeople, and they see things, and do things, which they never did before.

3132. Do you not think that that extremely uncertain work, hawking work, is in itself injurious to the people?—Yes; but you must educate them out of it, and we can only hope that having got the people into decent dwellings, and having got their children to school, where they never went before, we shall get the next generation out of this plan of living.

3133. And they will try to get work in some more permanent place?—Yes.

3134. Then they would have to go further to seek work?—Yes.

3135. And if you could set them down now in some decent place, it would come to the same thing?—They would possibly die, or get very unhappy; because the parents cannot get other work. You cannot get the parents to adopt the same method of work as the children will, when educated.

3136. When you get the whole population improved, there will not be work for them in that neighbourhood, because they will not be satisfied with this miserable, casual work?—If the time comes when there shall be no more hawkers, and when fewer labourers are wanted than now.

3137. You would like to have fewer hawkers and dock labourers?—I should, but I do not see the way of doing it.

3138. If you got this population removed to a more distant place, you would think it was, speaking nationally, a good thing?—I do not say getting the population removed, but getting the population improved would be nationally a very good thing, the mere removal would do no good whatever.

3139. Ultimately, when they are all removed, they will have to look for their work at some distance?—Yes, when it does come to pass.

3140. Then if you get them away from the centre at once, it would be a good thing?—No, if you get these same people away from the centre, you would be cruel to them.

3141. In the end it would be a benefit to their children?—It is a great benefit to educate their children, but if you send the people away into the suburbs, they cannot support the children that they have; you must support them by the rates.

3142. That is just for a time?—Yes, just for the time I am speaking of.

3143. Sometimes when a whole society has got into a low, demoralised, wretched condition, it may be better to make a break into it, than patch it up?—Yes, and I should like it done by putting them in better houses; then you would improve the people, and improve the children through them, which is the best way of doing it.

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

3144. And you think the better houses must be there?—I think so; a great extent of the better houses must be there, because this work has to be done near there.

3145. Only that there are too many people to do it?—Yes, one would say so, but they all live.

3146. In this miserable hand-to-mouth way?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3147. You think it your duty, as a minister of the Gospel, to endeavour to put the Acts of Parliament in force, which would give the people a chance of better houses?—Yes.

3148. Although it may be true that, after you have done it, as far as the site will allow, there would still be a surplus that cannot be housed comfortably?—Yes.

3149. Do you consider, either under the Act of 1868 or 1875, the reparation that might be effected would be any reason or obstacle in the way of a wise system of emigration to the Colonies, to take off the surplus?—I do not think so.

3150. May I ask you to give the Committee something of a narrative of the facts that you have already alluded to, with regard of the failure to put into force the Act of 1868. What was the form of houses that you proposed to condemn through the vestry?—I could not describe it. It was the whole of Castle-alley, which was a small court leading out of High-street, Whitechapel, through which you passed going down to the Board School, a very narrow little place, that we represented as being unhealthy and unfit for habitation in every other way. The vestry quite agreed, and three or four representations were made.

3151. In what year?—One was made in 1868; the medical officer represented that five houses in Jacob's-court were unfit for habitation; the surveyor reported that the houses were dilapidated, and that the most economical way would be to pull them down and rebuild them. At an interview between the surveyor and the owner of the houses, it was agreed that repairs should be done; that was the end of it all.

3152. You stated to the Committee that the vestry shrank from what they thought the cruelty of pulling down these houses when they could not build on the narrow site that would remain?—They felt the cruelty to the owner rather than the cruelty to the people.

3153. Why was it cruelty to the owners?—Because there was not power of giving compensation.

3154. Are you aware that the Act, while passing through Parliament, was divested of the power of giving compensation?—Yes.

3155. And Dr. Liddle agreed with you, that it was a reasonable ground of consideration, at all events by the vestry, whether they would destroy the property without any compensation to the owners?—Yes.

3156. Have you tried it at all since power has been given by the Amended Act of 1879?—No, we have been content with the working of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act; it covered the whole of my parish, really.

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

3157. You think that the vestry, as far as you know, would have been disposed, if they had power, to have yielded to your solicitation and have pulled them down?—I can only imagine that.

3158. You do not think that it was any obstinate or selfish motive that deterred them?—No.

3159. Is there any ground vacant that might have been used by private persons, or by a company to rebuild, so as to re-house those who were dispossessed?—Yes; at that time the ground on which Mr. Crowder's houses are now built was vacant.

3160. Is there any more than that?—There is a saw-yard vacant now upon which houses might be built.

3161. What is the average number of storeys of the dwelling-houses in your parish?—They are low houses, two storeys high.

3162. Is there any reason, from the nature of the place, or the width of the streets, why those houses, if rebuilt, might not be rebuilt with more storeys?—Yes; I think most of the streets are very narrow.

3163. You think the houses cannot be raised higher?—Not in the narrow streets.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

3164. Was not one of the reasons why the vestry did not put in force Mr. Torrens' Amending Act of 1879, that the expense of the Act falls on the vestry, and the expense of the Artizans' Dwellings Act falls upon the whole metropolis?—It may be so.

3165. Have you any plan for getting rid of the expense of carrying out the Act of 1875. You are aware that is the great difficulty of carrying out the Act?—I think the plan which I suggested to the Chairman would do away with some of the expense and delay; of course there must be a great deal of expense in keeping ground vacant for a year.

3166. You do not suggest that the property should be purchased at different times, but that it should be demolished at different times?—I would purchase at once and demolish in the course of 10 or 20 years, giving time to fill in the new and leaving some of the old standing.

3167. That would not diminish the cost of the original purchase?—No. I do not know how you can diminish the cost of the purchase except as provided by the amended Act of 1879, giving only the real value after repairs had been estimated; that would reduce the cost of purchase, I think.

3168. I want to know with regard to the people that you speak of, the clannish kind, who help each other, do they live in these condemned areas. Take the Flower-and-Dean-street scheme; do they live there?—Flower-and-Dean-street is out of my parish, but they do live in the condemned area of George-yard, and part of Wentworth-street.

3169. That is included in the scheme?—Yes, it is included in the scheme; but Flower-and-Dean-street is just outside my boundary.

3170. Then you have in this scheme bad and good mixed up, I suppose?—Yes.

3171. As well as bad and good houses?—Quite so; bad people do not always live in the bad houses.

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

3172. You do not think that the bad people should be re-housed?—No; I think the common lodgers may as well live somewhere else.

3173. Then there are a certain number of thieves, are there not?—Yes, in the common lodgings; in Flower-and-Dean-street the houses are not very bad, as you saw.

3174. It seems to me that if there is such a mixture of the population, a very considerable number, at any rate, should be able to go away; surely it is not necessary that they should all live upon this particular spot?—It is not necessary for these cadgers and casual labourers, but it is necessary for a considerable number of others, and I would say this, too; that very often there is a great deal more work than the people can do; at the time when the wool sales come on, and the ships come to the docks, every hand is employed, and many men have to be kept there, not for the work they do every day, but for work they may possibly have to do.

3175. But I suppose dock labourers can live in a much larger area?—Yes.

3176. They could be scattered considerably?—Yes.

3177. What suggestions have you to make in order to prevent houses becoming insanitary, and getting in this filthy state?—Closer management; of course, I should say that our system of managing prevents it; our system of having two or three rent collectors going down two or three times a week.

3178. But as far as the law is concerned, would you have more stringent sanitary laws?—I should; supposing houses are built of a kind like Mr. Crowder's, I should apply to those houses very strict sanitary laws.

3179. Have you had any experience of those regulations as to houses being let out in tenements; I do not mean common lodging-houses; there are certain regulations which the Local Government Board have made with regard to houses let out in tenements, limiting the number of occupiers for each house?—I have no experience of that.

3180. Could anything of that kind be made to answer?—I do not know at all; I should not like to say.

3181. What was the case that you spoke of, where the jury awarded a much smaller amount than Mr. Rodwell?—In Castle-alley.

3182. Do you know the name of the owner?—Mr. Castleberg.

3183. I see Mr. Rodwell gave evidence that the award in that case was 4,874 *l.*, and the verdict of the jury was 2,700 *l.*; do you know whether there have been many cases of that sort?—I do not know; it does not come within my experience.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3184. You said that the Goulston scheme had taken five years to work out; have you any complaint to make against the Metropolitan Board of Works for slackness in carrying out the Act?—I do not know whether you are to blame; somebody is.

3185. How far is the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme from your district?—Not very far.

3186. That

Sir *James M'Garel Hogg*—continued.

3186. That was taken up at once, was it not?—Yes.

3187. With 13 schemes you will allow that each district should have a benefit?—Yes; I do not wish to blame; I only find fault.

3188. Will you kindly tell me this: you said you thought the purchasing authority might keep up a certain number of the best houses, and pull down the others?—Yes.

3189. Were you alluding to private or public purchase?—I do not care which, whether you sell to public or private parties.

3190. Supposing a public body purchased this one, could they keep up a certain number, eight or nine years, and pull down the rest, because, from my experience, we must pull down a certain section so as to enable us to have buildings for the benefit of the poor built upon it; how can you manage if you pull down a few houses and leave some standing?—I know this particular plot, and if this were placed in my hands I should build a block upon one spot, and leave certain other houses standing; you pulled down three houses fronting George-yard; that is beginning the wrong way. Why those three were pulled down I cannot conceive; they were not the worst houses; they were in better order than many houses not condemned, and yet they have been destroyed, and nothing has been put upon the site since; there is nothing to prevent that site being covered at once; I should have covered it at once if it had been in my own hands.

3191. If you clear a space and you have a certain number of poor people on it; if you widen streets and make better ventilation for light and air, can you re-house those people by simply patching the houses up, or adding a storey to them. I only ask for information; I should be glad to learn; supposing there is a square acre, and say 2,000 or 3,000 people living upon it, you must, if you want to improve approaches, and widen streets, naturally make the buildings higher to accommodate the same number of people?—Yes.

3192. If you pull down the worst houses and patch up the best ones, you could not possibly re-house the same number?—I only ask for time; give us 10 or 20 years to do it.

3193. Would not that be a great loss to either public or private persons?—Not so great a loss as is incurred now.

3194. I think it would be a great deal greater; have you any figures to prove the contrary?—I do not know whether, in the Glasgow Scheme, there was not something allowed for the gradual rebuilding.

3195. You have no figures to prove it?—No.

3196. I understand that in the Goulston-street Scheme no houses have been pulled down that have not been reported to be in an insanitary state?—The Flower-and-Dean-street Scheme is the one that I am speaking of.

3197. But there was nothing pulled down there that was not insanitary, was there?—I was there just before they were pulled down, and they were not anything like so insanitary as the others that were left.

3198. They were reported, were they not, to be in an insanitary state, or we should not have acted upon it?—I cannot understand why they

Sir *James M'Garel Hogg*—continued.

should be pulled down, and those which are very disgraceful left behind.

3199. Perhaps you will give me a list of those?—I will.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3200. Are there any other districts within the parish, or near it, that ought to be dealt with under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—I think they are all scheduled.

3201. As I understand, you do not know of any other district that ought to be dealt with in the same way?—No. Dr. Liddle was very quick, and a great many places were scheduled in Whitechapel.

3202. Supposing in any district thus dealt with, it appeared upon examination that one-half of the people living there found employment at a distance, do you still think it would be necessary to provide buildings for them within that district?—I should say not.

3203. Do you not think that it would be desirable with a view of diminishing the cost of carrying out the scheme, that a little inquiry should be made when the scheme is undertaken, as to the number of people living there who are really finding employment, and who have been living in the district or within a reasonable distance?—You might look further than the employment. West End people would not like to have to live exactly where they are working; they have their tastes, and they have their friendships to keep up.

3204. Is there any reason why the Metropolitan Board of Works should go to a great cost to provide people with houses at a particular spot because of their taste, apart from any convenience of living near their work?—I should think other than material objects should be thought of, and there is a material advantage that by living near their friends they do get help in times of trouble.

3205. But you must also consider the question of the incidence of the cost of the whole thing upon the ratepayers; that is a matter, is it not, which has to be considered?—Yes.

3206. The ultimate cost of all these operations must fall upon the ratepayers, and a proportion of it will fall upon the very people whom it is intended to benefit?—Yes.

3207. Are not the high rents there positively affected by the metropolitan rates?—Yes.

3208. Therefore we must take into consideration not merely the interests of the people to be dispossessed, but also the interests of the ratepayers all over London?—Yes, but the ratepayers have allowed them to grow up in that state.

3209. It is not the ratepayers who allowed them to grow up, but the owners of the property, and any loss ought, in the first instance, to fall upon the owners of the property?—They ought to be looked after by the ratepayers' representatives.

3210. By the Government?—Yes.

3211. Will not that argument come to this, that the Legislature which permitted this state of things to grow up, ought to bear the cost of removing them, rather than the locality?—Yes; I am only concerned for the locality.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3212. With regard to a question asked by the honourable Member for Reading, was this matter ever considered by the vestry, that if you put up better dwellings they would be better rateable property than the ones taken down?—It has been suggested to the vestry.

3213. Do you believe it to be so?—It is the fact upon the other side of the parish in the Limehouse scheme, that there is an increase of 700 *l.* a year in the rating.

3214. Therefore the supposed injury to the ratepayers is ephemeral?—Yes.

Chairman.

3215. I suppose the ratepayers get a great advantage owing to the improved health and morals of the people?—Yes, that is very important. As a guardian, I used to see 20 or 30 applications every week; I have only seen two from the same block since the Peabody dwellings have been built, which makes a very large difference to the rates.

3216. I understand what you particularly wish is, that if one of these areas is condemned, and a scheme is passed, if possible some of it should be pulled down and reconstructed at once, and the other houses should be improved in the meantime, so that there should not be so much displacement?—Yes, that is what I mean.

3217. You were saying that, to a certain extent, you preferred Mr. Crowder's houses to the Peabody Buildings?—Yes.

3218. Is that in consequence of the fact that the Peabody Buildings could not supply what was wanted by this class of people?—I think so, and the Peabody Buildings inflict too many rules upon the people.

3219. I presume you have no objection to improved dwellings, and large houses?—I like them.

3220. But you would advise that there should be more single rooms?—Yes.

3221. And you also would advise that there

Chairman—continued.

should be some place where the people could wash?—Yes.

3222. Or that the rules should not exclude their washing?—Yes, I would allow the women to take in washing. I went to Sir Sydney Waterlow and Sir Curtis Lampson to urge upon them the necessity for single rooms, but they both refused to see it. I am certain you must get single rooms into which you must put these people, as the first step.

3223. Can you say what the objection to single rooms is?—The same objection that was taken just now, these gentlemen would not bear seven or eight people living in a single room.

3224. That it would be encouraging overcrowding?—Yes.

3225. If you had more single rooms, you would make a rule that they should not have too many living in them?—We take them in, and having got them into our dwelling, every kind of influence is brought to bear upon them, to make them send out their children, or to take two rooms.

3226. If there were single rooms sufficient, and they were allowed to wash there, you would as soon have a large building as Mr. Crowder's building?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3227. If an improvement is completed under the Act of 1875, and the block is re-covered with dwellings, will there remain any patches of overcrowded and dilapidated dwellings in the parish?—I think there is one block which is left out; it is surrounded by many shops in the High-street, and it is difficult to bring it in.

3228. It would not be suitable under the purview of that scheme?—No.

3229. What must you do under those circumstances?—Apply the Act of 1868, as amended.

3230. And it would be more suitable to have a limited space?—Yes.

Miss Octavia Hill, re-called; and further Examined.

Chairman.

3231. Have you anything that you wish to add to the evidence which you gave at the last meeting?—No, I do not think so.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

3232. Have you any plan for preventing houses getting into an insanitary state; I do not mean a plan such as you would carry out by private individuals, but a plan to be carried out by law?—I cannot think of any plan, except that the official inspection should be more thorough.

3233. Do you think that the Sanitary Acts are sufficient at present, if they were properly administered?—I should have thought so in London; I do not know whether in the outskirts it is due to the inefficiency of the Sanitary Acts or not; but it is the fact that many buildings are put up in the suburbs which are very unsatisfactory indeed.

3234. Then with regard to Mr. Torrens' Acts,

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

have you had any experience of their working?—None at all.

3235. Do you know the principle of the Act?—Yes, I know the Acts very well.

3236. Do you not consider that they would be very efficient Acts for the purpose of keeping up houses of a certain standard of habitability?—The only thing I do know about the working of them is, that in our own parish it has been unsatisfactory; I do not know whether they could be better carried out than they have been.

3237. Will you describe what the working was?—The alterations made were so very superficial, but there was a very great deal to be done; very often really structural alterations are required.

3238. That would be rather a defect in the administration of the Act?—Yes.

3239. Do you know of any cases where houses were shut up or demolished under those Acts?—No,

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

No, none. I know cases where a threat of demolition has been very useful.

3240. Have you any suggestions to make as to the expense of carrying out this Act, which is one of the great difficulties of the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—No, I do not think I have any suggestions to make as to how it could be done effectually; I can only say that individuals manage more economically; I suppose it is by extreme care about the details of expenditure. I am amazed to hear people quoting 3 *d.* a foot as the ground rent that can be paid for land for poor people's dwellings, because in cases where I have been anxious to clear courts, and have bought the leases of old houses, and had them pulled down and rebuilt, they are paying a much greater rental.

3241. What have they cost?—I make 9 *d.* a foot in the place where I pay most, but we have several at 6½ *d.* and 7 *d.*

3242. Do you find that 9 *d.* a foot pays?—We can make it touch four per cent.; all our other courts pay five per cent.; 9 *d.* a foot pays four per cent.

3243. Sixpence a foot you make pay easily four per cent.?—I should not like to generalise about it, but we are paying five per cent., and lay aside a considerable amount. Where we have had to buy the houses, and pull them down and rebuild, the reason why it cost so much is that they have been high houses, and the ground very much built over; but if even this can be made to pay 4 per cent by individuals, it seems to me that it ought to be able to be done without absolute loss by public bodies.

3244. Have you a decided view as to the replacing of the whole number that have been displaced?—A very decided view, indeed. I do not think it would necessarily be the same people that would come back, but it is a great advantage to preserve in central London as many poor as are now there. Of course the poor population is increasing enormously, and it seems to me if the suburbs provide for the increase that is quite as much as they ought to do; because there are a very large number of trades necessitating people living near, and there are families where several members are at work, and where if the people are sent to the suburbs, it is impossible to keep the family together.

3245. Do you know any areas which have been pulled down under the Artizans' Dwellings' Acts? I have not seen any of the districts lately that have been pulled down, though I know them.

3246. Do you know the people who live in them sufficiently to be able to say that they must be there on account of their work?—Yes, I should say so, decidedly.

3247. What areas are you thinking of?—I was thinking of the one up near Beaumont's-buildings.

3248. What do the inhabitants consist of chiefly?—I do not know that I ought to say that I know the inhabitants; but we own some houses adjoining them, and I know that there is a very great demand for poor people's houses there, and I should be very sorry to see the number of poor people's houses in Marylebone decreased. I feel myself very differently about districts like Marylebone, and districts like Whitechapel; where you get acres and acres of poor people together it is a very good thing to move some of them:

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

but where you have a large body of richer and more educated people living in the neighbourhood, and there is a great demand for labour, it is very important to keep the poor amongst them; if we send people to the suburbs, they go to cheaper suburbs, and we are creating for ourselves over again such districts as we are lamenting to find existing in the East End of London; they are working people suburbs.

3249. Is not that because there are only penny trains upon certain lines?—It may be so in part.

3250. Do you know the population of Beaumont's-buildings Scheme?—No.

3251. Do you know of what occupation they are?—In Beaumont's-buildings there are costermongers, and that class of people, and they are a very low class.

3252. I see Providence-place is included?—Yes.

3253. Would that be costermongers too?—That is a low class of people.

3254. Then there are Edward's-place, and Britannia-gardens?—As to Edward's-place, I hope houses for the poor may be rebuilt there.

3255. What is the population there?—The very lowest of the people, but I should be very sorry not to see workmen's buildings there. With regard to the whole of Marylebone, when the leases fall in, the houses are rebuilt for a slightly higher class, and, except in the places we own ourselves, the poor are being steadily excluded; the tendency of things is to exclude them from Marylebone.

3256. Can you stop it?—You may stop it by providing dwellings to be let to them; by this process we have provided for a few of that class; in Walmer-street, for instance.

3257. That is very small compared with the other process that is going on, is it not?—We have been doing what we can, and I should hope to do a great deal more; there are a number of people working at Oxford-street and Bond-street, who live in our houses, tailors and shoemakers, going two and three times a day backwards and forwards to their work, with their sons and daughters employed in the same way. I do not know what they would do if sent away.

3258. Take Edward's-place, the population is of such a kind that you would not care to re-house them?—I should care very much indeed to re-house them.

3259. You think they are improvable?—I always believe in people being improvable; they will not be improvable without a good deal of moral force, as well as improved dwellings. If you move the people they carry the seeds of evil away with them; they must be somewhere, and they want improved dwellings that they can inhabit, and care taken of them.

3260. Do you think they would go into any new dwellings if they were offered to them?—I think they would if the dwellings were properly arranged. First of all there must be more of these single rooms than are built, and I think that a good deal should be done by volunteer work in the buildings before you touch the very poor; they have not the courage to face the large cleaner places, unless somebody knows them and introduces them. I do not believe that this difficulty will ever be met, except by a good deal of volunteer work; whether the large societies will enlist volunteers, or whether it will be done by private enterprise,

Mr. *John Hollond*—continued.

I do not know; but I am certain you can hunt the poor about from place to place, rout them out of one place and drive them to another; but you will never reach the poor except through people who care about them and watch over them.

3261. Then your idea would be, as far as possible, not so much to keep up the stock of dwelling-houses for workmen, as actually to replace the same people?—Yes, as far as I could.

3262. The people in Edward's-place must be near their work too, you think?—A great many of them; all these central positions are easier of access for workmen; if you drive the people to the suburbs, if their work lies at the extreme end of London, it is very difficult to get to it; a central place is necessarily easier to get from, and though at some times they have to go some distance from the centre, they have never to go very far. I do not think you can, without very great evil, drive away the poor from such a parish as Marylebone.

3263. Do you think that this area must necessarily be cleared, or do you think it could be dealt with under Mr. Torrens' Act; is it necessary to demolish it?—I should have thought so, because first of all very few people are accommodated in it for the area; there is a very bad sinking in the ground, which I should think would make houses very damp, unless they are in some way raised; you go quite down a slope from Seymour-place, and the houses at the back have very small back yards, which are in a terrible state; there are two lines of buildings now, and it would be very much better with one line of buildings in the middle.

3264. Do you think the whole area would have to be demolished in the same way, Beaumont-buildings, Providence-place, Edward's-place, and Britannia-gardens?—They must be included in one scheme for the sake of convenience, though they are in different places.

3265. You might deal with these different blocks of houses in different ways; some you might demolish and some you might improve?—The Beaumont-buildings Scheme would be much easier dealt with by demolition; they are only one-storey high.

3266. You know Britannia-gardens?—Not well.

3267. Do you think those houses must be demolished?—I do not know them well enough to say.

3268. Do you know Providence-place?—I do not know it well enough to say anything about it.

2369. Do you know Beaumont-buildings?—I know Beaumont-buildings, and they must be demolished.

3270. Out of the four, the two you know, namely, Edward's-place and Beaumont-buildings, you think ought to be demolished?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3271. You think that gradual rebuilding ought to proceed with gradual demolition?—Yes.

3272. And without that great aggravation must necessarily ensure in the condition of those who are taken away?—Yes.

3273. Have you found from your own experience that the courts and alleys that you have been able to get under your control, have been made really sufficiently habitable to be safe for

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

health and decency, by repair, in many cases, without demolition?—I had tried repairing them usually for a great many years before I had them rebuilt, in order to get hold of the people; but finally when the people have improved I have rebuilt a good many of them by preference, because I can give them better accommodation in the new buildings.

3274. I am anxious to know what your experience has been, from the great observation you have given to the subject, of the gradual decay, and the worsening of the houses from being overcrowded?—The houses I have known have been steadily improving rather than steadily decaying.

3275. With repair?—Yes.

3276. But without repair, what happens?—If they are without repair, and without anyone in charge, the tenants break the banister rails, burn the door panels, and the plaster rots away before anybody touches a thing; you can pull out the beams by handfulls in many places.

3277. Have you observed that houses decay from over-crowding and become less healthy?—I do not see how the actual over-crowding can cause decay.

3278. By the mere intensification of filth?—Yes; and the plaster rotting away,

3279. And the want of repainting?—Yes; an immense deal might be done by enforcing the covenants of leases in these places, if people would do it.

3280. Did I understand you to say that the process, first of repair and then rebuilding, ought to be always going on in a densely crowded district?—I should think so; we want all these courts reformed.

3281. And you are strongly opposed to the severance of classes for the sake of creating extra rural slums?—Yes, very strongly; it is a loss to the rich and poor when they are so much separated.

3282. Have you known any of those places to which this has been done; do you know any of those abutting upon St. Pancras?—Yes.

3283. Which do you know best?—I know them best up towards the north-west.

3284. The Kensal-green district?—Yes, and I know something of the Tottenham district.

3285. I believe you have not had your attention sufficiently directed to the Soho, or the St. Giles' district?—Drury-lane would be in St. Giles'. I have had a great deal to do with Drury-lane, Eversley-court, Granby-place, and Star-court.

3286. Have you found much difficulty in obtaining at a reasonable cost the sites you wish to rebuild upon?—We have to go quietly about it; I could not get them if I appeared myself in it. I never give a fancy price.

3287. Is not the difficulty of obtaining sites for rebuilding a greater difficulty in the way of municipalities than private persons?—Yes, but if one keeps one's eyes open, one can get them, and I have the advantage of being able, by going into the thing very economically and carefully, to make the thing pay. Several courts I have been told it was impossible to touch. I have not only touched them, but I have got them rebuilt.

3288. From your own knowledge you say that bad courts are very good investments to usurers?—I do

Mr. *Torrens*—continued.

—I do not know what proportion of rental they get; if they get the entire rental it would be enormous, and in some of the worst courts they get a very enormous amount of rental.

3289. But they hold it very tight?—Yes, and you will find that your worst tenants sometimes pay the best; they do not want to be asked how they get their rents.

3290. Is it also within your knowledge that persons having these courts like them so much as property that they buy others?—Yes, they hold them as tight as can be.

3291. Is it not notorious that there are large court grubbers, so to speak, who are extending their investments?—Yes.

3292. And who would not part with them at any reasonable price unless legislative power is put in operation?—Yes, Edward's-place is an instance of that.

3293. Therefore you think that the Act of 1875, as well as the Act of 1858, as amended, are both necessary to keep this down?—I think so, decidedly.

Viscount *Emlyn*.

3294. You said you thought that an area like Whitechapel should be dealt with in a different way from one like Marylebone?—It does not seem to me in itself so great a loss to remove poor people where a large number of them are congregated together. I feel a great deal about the evils arising from the separation of class and class, and in such districts as Whitechapel you have not that additional reason for regretting the removal of the poor. Still at present Whitechapel, and many of the poorer districts, are badly provided with dwellings for the poor; therefore I should be glad to see any property coming into the hands of any public body rebuilt for them; I should be really sorry to see working people immigrating from our own district.

3295. Would not it be of advantage to the poor, in an area like the Whitechapel area, if you could put in their midst a certain amount of the middle class?—Yes, but you must provide the poor first with dwellings.

3296. Would it be possible to do it, and at the same time provide for another class?—The natural thing would be to destroy the worst places, and to build good workmen's dwellings on them, and afterwards to let the other places settle themselves, which means to go into the hands of the higher class.

3297. And your object would be to provide labour for these poorer people upon the spot, by providing a class who would require a certain amount of labour from them?—Yes, partly; but the classes do much for one another in other ways besides.

3298. You mean that it would improve them socially?—Yes, and raise the standard of the people. A great deal of the degradation of these courts is because no public opinion reaches them; if you hear anybody talk about a *cul de sac*, and contrast it with any place that is a thoroughfare, you feel at once that is the public opinion that affects the character of a court more than police or anything else; the same thing is done by higher class people living amongst them; the dirt, and degradation, and habits of

Viscount *Emlyn*—continued.

the people sink when they are removed from people who are more educated than themselves.

3299. And you would be guided by something beyond actually providing new houses; you would break them up?—Yes.

3300. They might be rather difficult to deal with; you have only a certain area to deal with?—If I had the decision of that I should not hesitate in clearing any area which has been occupied by the poor, and re-instating the poor upon that. I should like to do that everywhere in London. There is a great need of accommodation for work people near their work.

3301. Then we have to wait in that case till the lowest class has improved so far as to seek work elsewhere?—The tendency would be when these better buildings are built, for the higher class of working people to come and take them, because they prefer being near their work, and they will will give much less trouble to their landlords, and they would be able to pay a slightly higher rent; therefore you bring a better class of working people amongst the poor; that would be the first result. We have difficulty when we re-build to get the same people in; we have a tendency to get a rather higher class of work people, and it would be an improvement in Whitechapel.

Mr. *Cropper*.

3302. You are speaking of mixing up the classes; would the people who would go to Whitechapel be a higher class at all. You could not get well-to do-people to go and live in the east of London?—No, I do not suppose you could.

3303. If there were vacant areas there, you would let them be sold for what they could be at commercial prices?—Not until the working classes of Whitechapel are better housed; there are very few good houses for the poor in Whitechapel at present.

3304. I understand they would hardly go into good houses, because the poor cannot afford it?—I think they would go into them if they were built with suitable rooms; at present they have to take three rooms at once if they want to go in; and it seems to me a very great difficulty. At present all the model dwellings are built in sets of rooms.

3305. You cannot expect in Whitechapel to build up society as you would in Marylebone?—You would, because you could get a higher class of workpeople to go where the rooms are good. I speak with less authority about Whitechapel than about Marylebone.

3306. You say you have 60,000 *l.* in property?—Yes, about that under my charge.

3307. Will you tell us about how many tenants you have?—It is difficult to define my work.

3308. How much does the 60,000 *l.* worth of property represent?—I think 2,000 or 3,000 people, but you cannot tell by the money; because if you have freehold you may spend 4,000 *l.* or 5,000 *l.* and accommodate 30 families, and if you have a leasehold you may spend a very much smaller amount, and have a much larger number of families.

3309. Can you say roughly how many families this represents?—I am afraid I cannot tell you.

3310. In the houses which you have improved

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

do you find that you can keep their condition pretty well up to the mark, without having a constant yearly outlay?—We have a constant yearly outlay, but the rental pays for it, and it is mostly educational work. We really introduce also the principle of co-operation; we set aside a certain sum for repair in each case. When we buy we only put in order the drains, water supply, and roofs; we then set aside a considerable sum for yearly improvements. I tell the tenants what it is, and I say, "The more careful you are the more comfortable your house will be." I spend it and give them an account of it, and it has a most wonderful effect upon them; and steadily and gradually we improve the houses, quarter by quarter, with that sum; but the time comes when the tenants are a good deal raised; and after doing that we often take a bit of the court and rebuild it, because we can give better accommodation, and we still manage to pay either four or five per cent.

3311. When you pull down one of your blocks to rebuild, what is your way of dealing with the tenants?—Where it is possible I give them a long notice. I move them, as far as they will go, into other places of my own. I am obliged to move them in order to rebuild. I sometimes rebuild one court in three bits, and then I take back as many of my old tenants as can come into the first bit, and let them stop there, and pull down another portion another year.

3312. Under the Act, 15 houses at a time is all that is to be pulled down?—I have never pulled down 15 houses at a time; five or six is the greatest number I have pulled down.

3313. How many families would there be in each house?—When we bought one of these courts there was a family in every room, 10 families in a house, so that we should have removed 60 families had we rebuilt at that time; but that was not the population when I pulled the houses down, because we persuaded many families to take two rooms. I cannot say exactly what the population was; something between 60 and 30.

3314. I see from your evidence you feel that the work will never be well done unless an immense amount of the element of volunteer agency and christian feeling is introduced in endeavouring to reform the people?—Yes, there is reformatory work as well as sanitary work to be done. The great difficulty with these people is their destructiveness; it is not the rentals that prevent them being taken into the model dwellings; but nobody is inclined to build single rooms because of the destructiveness of the lower class of tenants, and the difficulty of collecting their rents; room by room the rental of model dwellings is lower than that in the rest of London, and I look forward to some effort on the part of societies to enrol volunteer workers under them; then I think we might have them undertaking this lowest class; at present they are frightened at it. We must get well-trained volunteers into such work, and those who know anything about it must throw their strength into training volunteers for many years to come, because among the volunteers you want business powers; and you want the interest in the people too, and you do not find them ready-made together.

3315. You do not think the work can be done without a charitable agency?—If you call it

Mr. *Cropper*—continued.

charitable, I do not mean in the least assistance by alms. I am very anxious to see the thing self-supporting.

3316. But a higher charity?—I do not believe in the reform of people who have sunk low without some kind of voluntary work, or rather voluntary spirit, and that probably would be unpaid.

3317. I should have said "unpaid" instead of charitable?—Just so.

Chairman.

3318. But not unpaid as far as rents go?—No. I am anxious that the houses should be upon a sound, commercial footing, and pay fair per-centage. I speak of unpaid agency at work somewhere amongst the tenants, and something of that sort of co-operative principle will have to be introduced to make the tenants benefit by their care.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3319. I think the class of persons you have been mentioning, as occupying your improved houses, is much the same class as is to be found in the Peabody Buildings and the Industrial Dwellings?—I should think mine are very much lower; certainly, when we begin in every court, much lower than those touched by any large society. I do not believe any large society could touch them until they enlist volunteers.

3320. Probably, however, they are not so bad as the wrecking class, of whom we have heard, who set to work and in a short time destroy the improvements made under Mr. Torrens' Act, or the Nuisances Removal Act?—I do not know; but my people when I go amongst them at first would destroy anything; they would kick out the door panels and burn the cupboard doors.

3321. Then you have had experience of that class?—Yes.

3322. If you find in a room the door panels knocked out and other destruction occasioned, do you at once give notice to the persons to quit, or do you give them another trial?—It just depends upon what I think of their character.

3323. And that shows the great necessity of personal supervision, and personal attention to them, so that you may get a knowledge of their character?—Yes; directly they see that you will spend money upon putting things to rights, they are very apt to think you have a very long purse, and they can destroy anything; and it does not much matter.

3324. If it were necessary for the improvement of the streets, or for financial or sanitary reasons, to remove the existing inhabitants, from any of these districts that are mentioned in Question 2978, I suppose the number that could be removed without any very serious loss or discomfort, would vary very much according to the district, and the work done in the district?—Yes, I suppose so; but I believe we require as much accommodation as we have at present.

3325. Do not you believe that in places where there is a better class of labour, more loss and discomfort would be incurred in moving the people than where the labour is uncertain, and where the persons are more closely packed, as in some of the eastern parts of London?—Yes.

3326. It would be difficult for you to give us any

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

any notion what number of persons could be moved without any very great loss or discomfort, taking the Marylebone district, for instance?—I look at it less as a question of moving individual people than of accommodation for the poor in the neighbourhood, because there are a great many people now living away that would very thankfully come back; I do not think there is any part of the town where we have much better accommodation for the poor than in Marylebone, yet even there we still want more.

3327. In truth, against rapid improvement must be set loss and discomfort to the poorer classes?—Yes.

3328. More temporary loss and discomfort to the poorer classes, because you cannot replace them as quickly as they are turned out of their houses?—Yes.

3329. I suppose I may take it from your evidence that you would prefer not to see that rule extended, that forbids more than 15 houses to be taken down at a time?—I would rather see the work done gradually.

3330. Have you arrived at any conclusion whether 15 houses is a fair number to fix as a rule?—A great deal depends upon how you rebuild them. It is on the one hand usually expensive to rebuild few at a time, and on the other hand, inconvenient to the poor if you rebuild many at once. Each case should be decided on its merits.

3331. Do you desire to see any alteration made in the 33rd section of the Streets Improvements Act, or would you prefer to leave it as it is?—Looking at it from the point of view of the people, I would rather leave it as it is. I do not know whether it is desirable for other reasons.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3332. Do you know the district of Gray's-Inn-road?—Tolerably well.

3333. Are you aware that the Metropolitan Improvement scheme proposes to drive a road through, or rather to widen Gray's-Inn-road, and make it a very important thoroughfare?—Yes.

3334. One of the witnesses called before this Committee has told us that the result of the obligation thrown upon the Metropolitan Board in respect of Gray's-Inn-lane improvement, would be that the Board would be under an obligation to rebuild artizan's dwellings upon the frontage of Gray's-Inn-lane, and that that obligation will throw upon the Metropolitan Board a charge of 300,000 *l.*, namely, the difference of the value of these sites when used for commercial purposes, and when used subject to the obligation of building artizans' dwellings; inasmuch as upon this site accommodation can be provided only for 1,700 labouring people, that is 300 odd families; do you think that that is an obligation which ought to be maintained?—It seems to me a very remarkable thing to have planned it so as to take the frontage.

3335. The improvement is for the purpose of making a great thoroughfare through that part?—Why do not they take a little more land and accommodate the working people, not upon the frontage; why do they fix the limits of deviation so that they cannot do this.

3336. Assuming the facts I mention, is it in your opinion reasonable that the labouring people

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

should be provided with dwellings at that cost per family?—It seems to me very absurd to accommodate labouring people in a frontage such as that: there is no particular advantage in it, especially as several of the improved dwellings societies have the extraordinary regulation that they will not build shops.

3337. Let me bring under your notice another case, namely, that of Golden-lane and Petticoat-square, two districts already cleared by the City of London, within their district. It has been stated in evidence before this Committee that the difference in value of those two sites, if sold for commercial purposes, and if sold with the obligation of building artizans' dwellings upon them, is a difference between 11,000 *l.* a year of rental and 1,100 *l.* a year of rental, and that the families would be provided at the rate at least of about 1,000 *l.* a family; now, will you permit me to ask you whether you think that upon the whole that is a cost which the ratepayers ought to be called upon to bear?—You would hardly call it the cost, if the ground has been cleared on the understanding that it is for the purpose of accommodating the working people, and if you are comparing the cost of it with the possible value of the ground if re-sold for commercial purposes it is a price nobody has ever received, it is simply the enhanced value of the land; they would not have had that land to let, had it not been for this Act.

3338. Supposing it to be proved that it has cost the City about that capital sum to clear that land, namely, a capital sum representing 11,000 *l.* a year, I think it was 250,000 *l.*, and that the City can recoup themselves the whole of that expenditure by selling it for commercial purposes, what then?—What would they propose to do for the working people if they do not re-accommodate them?

3339. Looking upon the whole circumstance, the ratepayers and the working people, is it reasonable to throw upon the ratepayers that enormous difference between 11,000 *l.* a year and 1,100 *l.* a year?—I should not have thought the ratepayers in the City need cry out, as overtaxed, but I should think there might be a reasonable scheme submitted not so costly, and equally good, because I should think places were to be had which were not absolutely in the City, but which might be convenient for working people, not suburban places; and if there were a reasonable alternative scheme it should be considered.

3340. If the facts are correct, you would endeavour to mitigate the great cost by allowing the authority to provide within reasonable distance other dwellings at a less cost?—Yes, at the same time it appears rather a curious thing; first to clear a site on the understanding that you are going to do one thing with it, and then sell it at a large profit or a very large enhanced price.

3341. We do not go into the question as to whether it is wise to enter into these transactions of clearing large spaces?—What would you do instead; leave fever dens and places where the people are; can it be finally economical to leave such places as these are, nests of fever.

3342. It is a question what process you are to adopt?—I should have thought it a gain for the whole City, for the nation, to get rid of such places.

3343. Is it not then important with the view

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

of inducing local authorities to undertake schemes of this kind to reduce the cost of them as much as possible?—Yes, to reduce the cost of them: still they would have to work with care.

3344. Is it not a matter of consideration whether, upon the whole, it is worth while to replace artizans' dwellings upon these large sites, at a cost of 1,000 *l.* a family?—What I feel about that is, that I am not satisfied that the clearance has been done in the cheapest way possible. I have neither facts nor figures, except my own very small ones; but where I have cleared I can only say they have been very difficult problems, and they have come out very different from this.

3345. Take the case of the City; the land has been cleared three years, and nothing has been done as yet towards building upon it?—It seems perfect madness to lose three years' rental; no individual would dream of such a thing as that; nobody would pull down their houses in London and leave the land uncovered for three years.

3346. That has been done?—That is waste of so much money.

3347. I do not go into what is past, I am now looking at the present condition of things. Assuming that that is so, would it be reasonable or right, having regard to the interest both of labourers and ratepayers, to rebuild upon the old site artizans' dwellings at a cost of 1,000 *l.* a family?—I should rebuild the artizans' dwellings within reasonable distance; the people having been cleared under the Act, you must accommodate them; the obligation should not be set aside, the whole thing cannot be left to the ordinary law of supply and demand.

3348. I presume you admit that the interest of the ratepayers ought to be considered?—Yes, they ought to be considered by not leaving the place three years empty, and also by everything being done to diminish the cost in the first instance. Of course it is no use crying over spilt milk, but it seems to be a pity such an amount of money is spent. I have only my small figures to go upon, but such as they are there they are. We own several courts, where the houses had five floors. We have rebuilt them, and they pay 4 per cent.

3349. Still, you had not the misfortune to buy them under compulsory powers?—No; but if I put 20 per cent. on for that I cannot help thinking that compulsory schemes ought not to be so costly; I make 4 per cent., why should the ratepayers lose thousands.

3350. I presume that it is from the fact that the local authorities have had to deal with large sites?—That may be so.

3351. I rather gather from you that, instead of going into this matter of a large scheme of pulling down and reconstruction, you would advise the thing being attempted by degrees, under Mr. Torrens' Act?—I should have thought that there were certain places that could only be done under a large scheme, and I should have thought in some way it ought to be cheaper to do in a large scheme. You have immense facilities for using up odd bits of land, and things of that kind. I can pay three times what people say they can pay for land per foot; that must mean greater care somewhere. Why should I be able to pay 9 *d.* a foot for land.

3352. You said that you thought that some of the buildings in the suburbs were in an unsatisfactory state, will you tell me where they are?—I do not know them of my own knowledge; I have a number of workers who come to me, and they describe things to me.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3353. You made the statement from hearsay?—I made the statement from communications addressed to me from the district workers, clergy and others.

3354. Are they within the metropolitan area, or without?—I do not know. I wrote to them to find out whether it was a deficiency in carrying out the Act, or in the Act itself, but I do not know which it is.

3355. You said, in answer to the right honourable Chairman, that there was 60,000 *l.* invested in the houses?—Yes.

3356. Have you any capital to dispose of?—We have never any difficulty in getting capital to any extent. I should know where to turn for it.

3357. You know where to turn for it?—Yes.

3358. May I ask you whether you ever read the newspapers, and whether you have ever seen the advertisements of the Metropolitan Board of Works and other public bodies, anxious to let land?—Yes.

3359. Having capital to dispose of, and being able to get it; and having to pay 6 *d.* or 9 *d.* a foot, has it never ocurred to you that it would be a good plan to make tenders for some of our land?—I mentioned also that a part of my own method depended for its success partly on personal supervision. Our money is invested, not so much to construct new dwellings for the people, which is very well done by large societies, for which I have the greatest respect, but to enable my fellow-workers to reach a lower class than societies can touch, by means of personal efforts; and I have much work opening before me in the poor courts as I have people for. I keep extending my work, going down into the very bad courts, and beginning among these people.

3360. Assuming the personal supervision, if you could get capital and build model dwellings, according to your own idea, would you not be able to have much more supervision over them if they were all put together in one building?—If I individually had to supervise them, clearly; but I have numerous friends working with me, and I prefer that each should take the lead in their own court. I would prefer the courts being under various people.

3361. You do not think that it would work so well?—I do not think it would work so well. Also, you see, if I built a large block of model buildings upon these sites I should have rather respectable, nice, working people coming to me, and whom I should be sorry to refuse; leaving the people these courts which are difficult to deal with, and among whom my duty and that of my fellow workers lies, and I do think that there are many good companies which can do the other work.

3362. You wish to confine your care to those who are poorer?—To those who are poorer and need reformatory work.

3363. You say that you take a court of 15 houses, and you would pull down five at a time; when you pull down the five houses, do you attempt to widen the court or street?—I have never attempted to widen a street.

3364. Do

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg*—continued.

3364. Do you think it advisible to do so; they are generally narrow; are they not?—Some are narrow and some are not.

3365. Most of them are narrow, are they not?—Not most of them.

3366. Up in Marylebone there are some which are pretty wide, but I have stood myself and been able to touch the houses on each side in some courts?—Yes; so have I.

3367. Therefore, would it not be better to widen them?—There the Artizans' and Dwellings' Act comes in. What I look at, before purchasing, is whether a court is one that can be dealt with mainly by improving the people and improving the houses; and I have seldom bought with the idea of rebuilding. I have introduced the idea some time afterwards. I have never rebuilt in a court that ought to be widened.

3368. You prefer going in detail?—Quite so. The work has assumed very much larger proportions now than I ever expected. But it is by blocks here and there that it has done good.

3369. Having that large experience, do you find that a good many people are anxious to buy this bad property?—Yes.

3370. There is a certain class of people who buy these properties for the purpose of extracting very large rents?—Yes.

3371. You have also said that it is difficult to get these properties from them?—Yes.

3372. Assuming that they are all in this bad state, and assuming that a public body is to bring in a scheme, do you think that these people who have kept their houses in a bad and insanitary state ought to receive full money in compensation?—No, certainly not.

3373. Would you agree with me that it is simply a question of materials, and that would be sufficient compensation?—In most cases. I speak of a particular class of court.

3374. I speak of those houses which are insanitary, and kept in a bad way?—Taking such a court as Edward's-place, I should say, certainly.

3375. That is utterly bad?—Yes, utterly bad, both in moral government and structurally too.

3376. I think you have often found that the Metropolitan Board of Works have had to pay much more than they ought on account of the awards of arbitrators in various ways?—No doubt they have.

3377. Where vast numbers of people such as those congregated in Whitechapel and Newport Market, where many are of the predatory class, and the houses in a most insanitary state, would it or not be of advantage to remove them to various districts?—I should not think it an advantage to move them.

3378. Why not?—Because I do not think you would make anything a bit better by moving them. Soho is a place where you want working people's dwellings.

3379. I talk of the lowest class?—What do you do by moving them?

3380. I mean moving them, and preventing them from being herded together in one mass of crime?—They settle all together somewhere else; that is my experience.

3381. Assuming they go to one place and another, would it not be an advantage to the community at large?—I should not think so, unless you get them a bit better.

3382. I understood you to say that you thought that the lower predatory classes were much improved by having some of the higher class of working people living with them?—I do not suppose they settle amongst the higher classes. If you routed out Newport Market to-morrow they would not do so.

3383. You do break up certain dens of iniquity; is not that advisable?—I do not know that it is advisable. I do not see why you should not accommodate working people upon such ground. Take such a place as Soho, it is very desirable there.

3384. I speak of the fact of breaking up places where the criminal classes are herding together; is it best to keep them together or break their haunts up?—I cannot see any advantage in breaking them up in that sense.

3385. You prefer keeping them where they are?—I do not like leaving them as they are, but I should not mind keeping them where they are.

3386. How would you deal with them; you must move them, must you not?—You must move them in order to rebuild; but at the same time, as I said before, you need only break them up in order to rebuild.

3387. Then what are you to do if you build up decent places, and these people that you move out will not go there?—You must take the people that will go there.

3388. You were talking of buying houses of this description; you will allow, will you not, that there is a good deal of difference between people buying in a friendly way, and when they take by compulsory powers?—I have no experience of compulsory purchase; I always thought it a question of 20 per cent.

3389. Ten per cent.; you are obliged to pay more; 10 per cent. is paid for approaches, not for bad property; you rather complained of some of the spaces which are left vacant a long time. Will you tell me what public bodies are to do when they are obliged by Parliament to clear certain spaces, and nobody will take them?—I suppose they put them up to auction first of all, and make the conditions such that people will take them.

3390. Suppose people will not take them, what do you say then?—There must be some reason why they do not take them.

3391. Having paid 1 *s.* per foot for them, and they go down to 9 *d.* and 8 *d.* and 6 *d.*, what would you say?—There are other reasons besides. Many people will not take land because a good deal depends upon the condition of the leases.

3392. Do you think that it ought to be sold at any price?—I think one has to meet all reasonable conditions. There are a great many other considerations besides money, but I think it must be a wasteful plan to have spaces left three or four years cleared.

3393. But at the same time, ought not a public body try to get the best price they can for their property?—Yes, the best price consistent with selling them for the purpose for which they were compulsorily cleared.

Mr. *Bryce.*

3394. Have you ever tried the plan of making a deduction in the rents of your houses, where the payment is made in advance?—Not where the payment is made in advance; but I have a block of houses under my care in Drury-lane, where half a week's rental was returned at the end of the half year to every tenant who was not in arrears, and I think it had rather a good effect.

3395. Is that the only case?—On returning from abroad, after some years, I found some of my own rents had been raised, which I did not approve of. The houses paid very well before, and I do not see any reason for raising the rents, and I am thinking of lowering them; but instead of that I have lately announced that I shall give a small bonus to every tenant who pays without fail on a Monday, all the quarter through. I should not have done that except that I was going to lower the rent, and I thought it a good plan. I have no experience of it yet. Our rents are paid very regularly in that neighbourhood.

3396. You do not seem to think the recovery of rent a serious difficulty in those cases. I thought that it was one of the most serious difficulties with the poorer classes?—We get a very large proportion of the rent from the very poor.

3397. It is one of the practical difficulties, is it not?—Yes.

3398. I understood you to say that that was one of the reasons why the poorer classes were not taken into the improved dwellings?—It gives trouble.

3399. Do you know that that system has worked well in Brooklyn, in America?—I do not know it. I should think it would be so. I think it is the right principle to go upon. At present, rents are very high amongst the poor, partly because a large number do not pay them; that is extensivly the case, because the honest pay for the dishonest, and anything counteracting that, is good in my mind; and I should be strongly in favour of introducing a bonus for punctual payment of rent. I have been talking to my fellow workers about it, and have urged them to hold their hands to see first how this works; but I am confident it is the right principle.

3400. Can you tell us of any other cases?—No, I cannot.

3401. You said, I think, that the rents charged in the improved dwellings range higher than the rents charged by ordinary private owners?—I think they are rather lower, room by room.

3402. Is not the reason why the poorest people prefer to go into private houses, that they are allowed to put more people into the same room?—I do not think it is merely that. I do not think the poorest people always prefer the private houses; but where a large number of people put down their names, as in the case of the Peabody Buildings, naturally the Peabody Trustees will choose the steadiest and highest class.

3403. Is it not the fact that the reason why the poorest class can get housed more cheaply in the bad dwellings, owned by private owners, is that they are not under the same restrictions as to crowding?—Partly; but I say they pay higher; and they cannot get single rooms in the improved dwellings.

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

3404. Is it not partly because the owners of the improved dwellings will not allow a family to be put into one room, and the private owners will?—Yes, it is; but it seem to me that it is right on the side of the private owners.

3405. In that case it is cheaper for them to go into private dwellings, because they can put more into a room?—Yes.

3406. Therefore, looking at that, you cannot say that the improved dwellings are cheaper than the private dwellings?—They are cheaper, room by room; if they built rooms separately they could accommodate the same people.

3407. But they are not cheaper, if you take a family of eight persons?—If you take a family of eight persons, that is another question; but take a family of three; suppose a man has a wife and one little girl, he does not necessarily want a suite of rooms for them.

3408. Would the improved dwellings allow them to go into one room?—They do so; but the single rooms they build are very small.

3409. I thought there were many single rooms, intended for seamptresses and washerwomen?—Yes, but they might be too small for a family of three.

3410. Do you and your friends working with you succeed in reaching pretty nearly the lowest class?—We succeed in reaching the very lowest class that has a settled habitation. When we first go into a court we raise a certain number with us; but there are a certain number who do not respond, and they slip away below us; they ought to be caught again, but they are not always. We begin with as low a class as have a settled abode.

3411. You reach a lower class than the improved dwellings succeed in reaching?—Yes.

3412. Why is it they fail to reach the lowest class?—First of all, their suites of rooms prevent them; then they begin with new buildings; then they advertise the new buildings, and they almost necessarily must take the best tenants that offer; but when I go in and buy a group of houses which I am interested in, occupied by a low class, I go round the next morning and collect my rents, as anybody else would, I get to know a little bit who the tenants are. There are thieves, and all sorts of people, and I go into underground rooms and all sorts of horrid places, and I get to know them and I say, "I do not want these underground rooms used any more. I have a nice room at the top of the house, will you not come up," and so on. I do not frighten them, and they are not afraid of what they call their bits of things coming among people who would scorn them.

3413. You say societies could only reach the lowest class by having volunteer efforts to help them?—Yes.

3414. In what way would that volunteer effort act?—If I had any volunteers to spare, I should like to go to the societies and put them in their hands to help them collect, but I do not think it would help them in their buildings. I expect they get their rents very well, but it would enable them to build for a lower class.

3415. And volunteers would collect their rents?—Volunteers would collect their rents throughout all the buildings.

3416. Because

Mr. *Bryce*—continued.

3416. Because you think the difficulty of collecting rents becomes greater the lower you go?—Yes, and the difficulty of managing people who have been in the habit of living in dirt, drunkenness, and disorder; you want some element between an official body managing the business and the tenants, helping them to deal with a much poorer class.

3417. It is not for a purpose of a kind charitable action?—There is nothing in the way of gifts or anything of that kind. I want them to get the people into better habits, and I think it is very important to get women to do it.

3418. I thought these people were rent collecting?—Rent collecting and dealing with all that grows out of it.

3419. Have you had any experience in the case of new dwellings erected where the upper floors were for residents and the ground floor was in shops?—I have built some myself.

3420. And have not you found that in those cases the shops let better because they have customers ready made?—Yes, I should say so; but my experience is not very large. I never have a shop unlet, and I have known shopkeepers say we have got our own people here.

3421. Would not that be an economical way of building?—Certainly, very economical.

3422. How do the rents that you charge compare with the rents of that property in private hands in the same neighbourhood?—I begin with precisely the same rents, because I do not want it to be a charity, and then I usually make a reduction in letting two rooms where they are wanted for occupation by one family. I am much opposed to sub-letting or anything that encourages it, but I let two rooms for a much lower rental than one.

3423. I gather that you would not allow your own tenants to sub-let?—No, not if I know it; and in order that they may have no great temptation to do it, I do not let a second room to them unless their family requires.

3424. Are the tenants all weekly?—Not in the shops; everything else is weekly.

3425. So that you could get rid of your tenants very quickly?—Yes.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

3426. You say that you think the class that you get into your dwellings are very decidedly inferior to those who go into the improved dwellings?—Yes, and especially the people who are in the houses when we buy them are inferior.

3427. Do you think these people who you take in would go in the improved dwellings if they had low enough rent and single rooms to begin with?—I think a good many of them would be very frightened; they are very shabby, and we only get them clean by degrees.

3428. They would be afraid of the superior class of people in the dwellings?—Yes.

3429. And they would feel themselves inferior?—Yes.

3430. Therefore you think even if they were met upon the question of rent and the accommodation of the rooms there would still be the difficulty in their minds in going into the improved dwellings?—Yes, unless they went a large number of them together.

3431. Do you collect your rents from your tenants once a week?—Once a week.

3432. And as a rule you get your rents paid regularly?—Yes, very regularly.

3433. I suppose you often have cases of tenants who stay a week or two and then disappear?—We have had such cases.

3434. And you get no rent at all?—Sometimes, not often. We have a very good percentage of rent, I think.

Chairman.

3435. Do you put any limit to the wages of the people to whom you let your houses?—No, I want to establish the scheme on very sound commercial principles.

3436. Supposing a person was earning 50 *s.* a-week and wanted to take one of your houses, would you take him in as well as any other?—Yes, unless I had any other particular friend or acquaintance that wanted to come in. Very often I have old tenants who want to come back. I would not question them as to what wages they were earning, however good. The question of assessment was mentioned. I think it does strike one as rather anomalous that the assessment is so immensely raised upon the cost of re-building. I do not know whether anything could be done about that, but where our rental remains the same after re-building or very slightly improved, the assessment is put up enormously in such cases. Our own vestry has been very liberal in meeting our wishes about it, but at the same time it does strike one as extraordinary the way in which the assessment is raised upon re-building.

3437. That is under the General Assessment Act, is it not?—Yes. Take one of the courts where our rental is raised one-third by re-building, our assessment is a good deal more than double.

Monday, 24th April 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Mr. Torrens.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD ASSHETON CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JOSEPH RAYNER, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3438. You are Town Clerk of Liverpool, are you not?—I am.

3439. And you are justice of the peace for the West Riding of Yorkshire, I believe?—Yes.

3440. Before we go into what happened at Liverpool, I may ask you whether you did not practice at Huddersfield from 1851 to 1861?—I did.

3441. And I believe you were connected with Sir John Ramsden's trustees?—Yes; our firm were local solicitors to the trustees.

3442. Those trustees are practically owners of the town?—They were of the then Huddersfield; it has since been extended.

3443. I believe you wish to explain something about the advantages which Huddersfield at that time possessed in consequence of that state of things?—Merely this, that Huddersfield, owing to that circumstance, was built as a town would be built now; that is, that all the regulations that have been prescribed by the Liverpool Local Acts, and by the Public Health Acts, were all practically in force there, because everybody had to build as Sir John Ramsden required; and the plans and elevations were submitted to Sir William Tite; that accounts for Huddersfield being such a beautiful town, taken in conjunction with the fact that beautiful stone is to be found in the neighbourhood.

3444. You were afterwards town clerk of Bradford from 1861 to 1866, and since that time you have been town clerk of Liverpool?—I have.

3445. Have you been engaged for the last 20 years in carrying out sanitary works and street improvements, under local Acts and Provisional Orders?—Yes, under both local Acts and public Acts, and Provisional Orders made under public Acts.

3446. I believe Liverpool has only had one scheme under this Act, called the Nash Grove scheme?—Yes, under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts.

3447. What was the acreage of it?—The acreage of the Nash Grove scheme is about $4\frac{2}{3}$ acres.

3448. Have you a plan of it there?—I have a plan of it here.

3449. It was in a very bad state, was it not?—

Chairman—continued.

In a very bad state, both as regards the streets, and what I may call the physical geography of the place. There was a deep dell in the middle of it which is now entirely done away with, and a street made across it.

3450. It is therefore a very great improvement, is it not?—Yes, it is a very great improvement.

3451. What was the estimated cost?—The net estimated cost was 62,254 *l.*, and the gross was 92,600 *l.*

3452. I believe the first part of the scheme was carried out with great expedition?—Yes, that is one of the great advantages no doubt of the machinery of this Act. The Provisional Order was confirmed by an Act upon the 15th of August 1876; there were no appeals, and the final award was made on the 9th of August 1877; that is in less than a year the whole thing was carried out.

3453. And the street made?—Yes; I have no hesitation in saying that if that property had been taken under the ordinary provisions of the Lands Clauses Act, with all the pressure we could have put upon the parties, it would have taken from two to three years.

3454. Speaking of the machinery of the Act of 1875, are you of opinion that it is very advantageous?—Very advantageous indeed; it is very much better than the machinery under which we carry out street improvements.

3455. Will you explain to the Committee why?—In this way. Under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts, there is a competent arbitrator of sufficient position and sufficient eminence to command respect, sent down, who deals with the whole of the cases as one tribunal; he holds a sort of assize, and he hears everybody and decides everything, and though there is an appeal from him in cases exceeding 500 *l.*, we have not had a single case of appeal. Under the ordinary process every claimant is entitled to a separate tribunal, and in an ordinary case of street improvement with a couple of hundred properties, every claimant is entitled to a separate tribunal, which is most vexatious in many respects. In the first place, the costs are something enormous compared with the amounts involved; secondly, the delay is very great, and it

Chairman—continued.

it is a very great inconvenience because all these tribunals have to be constituted. In case the claimant prefers a jury, you have to have a jury; first of all, you go to Preston to strike the jury, then you go to reduce the jury, and if you have arbitration you have each to appoint an arbitrator. They appoint an umpire, and there is great difficulty in getting them to agree upon the time they will sit, and this has to be repeated in every process all through.

3456. In your opinion, under the working of the Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875, you get through your scheme in less than half the time that you would have done otherwise?—Yes, much less than half the time.

3457. You say there were no appeals against Sir Henry Hunt's award?—Yes, there was one case in which I gave the man a trifle more than he awarded him, to avoid an appeal.

3458. How many cases were there in which there were objections to the provisional award?—There were 29 cases in which there were objections to the provisional award.

3459. Had you settled any cases with the claimants before you had Sir Henry Hunt at all?—I do not think so.

3460. How many cases were there in the whole scheme, do you know?—Some hundreds; it was 4⅞ acres of densely populated property.

3461. Do you know what the difference in the amount of the provisional award as a whole and the final award was?—The corporation appealed in some of the cases, and succeeded in reducing some of them. There was considerable difference in some cases, and that is easily explained.

3462. Will you just give us two or three of the cases in which there was a difference?—There was the case of Messrs. Benjamin & Co., a trade case, in which Sir Henry Hunt awarded 8,000 *l.*; that was considerably reduced. Another trade case was Ruddin's, and William Garlick's was another case; but the whole of the cases contested before him were only 29 in number.

3463. You have not the final award?—No, I have not the final award, but I can fill up the figures, and send them to you.

3464. Did the parties appear by counsel?—In many cases they did.

3465. I believe you hold the opinion that you might do away with the provisional award?—I think so; I think that the disadvantage of it is this, that the arbitrator goes upon the ground, and he only sees the claimant, the owner, and occupier of the property; sometimes he gets rather a strong impression, which I find it rather difficult to remove when we present the other side of the case to him, and I think if he heard all parties in the first instance it would be better.

3466. Is it your opinion that he should hold a sort of assize?—Yes, and summon all the parties to come before him, as he does after he has made his provisional award.

3467. But you would let him go and view the land first?—Yes.

3468. And you think it would make the matter simpler than it is at present?—I think so; I think there is no necessity for the provisional award, and it does in some cases create rather a difficulty in the case of a strong-minded man,

Chairman—continued.

who having once made up his mind after having heard only one side, it is rather difficult to alter his opinion.

3469. Were there any appeals by the 29 claimants, or were they all by the town council?—There were more by the claimants than by the corporation, but wherever a claimant appealed, I appealed, in order to be heard upon the other side.

3470. Were any of the claims increased?—Some were slightly increased.

3471. Is there any suggestion that you could make, in doing away with the provisional award, for improving the machinery of the Acts as they stand?—No, I do not think that as regards the machinery there is anything.

3472. Did you find the arbitrator deal with the bad property as you thought he ought to have done, or did he give too much for any of it?—No; I think he dealt fairly with the bad property; I think he had reference to the badness of it. The only thing in which he went beyond the spirit of the Act was in the case of small traders, shoemakers and tripe-sellers, and people of that class; though they were not entitled by law to anything, he gave them a trifle; they were fortnightly tenants, and he gave them 1 *l.* each for the cost of removal to new premises.

3473. Otherwise you think he did consider the badness of the property, and not give more than he ought to have done?—Yes; a great difficulty that he had was with reference to trade compensation; there were several opinions of counsel taken at the time. He allowed them trade compensation, and we did not appeal against it.

3474. In your opinion ought the trade compensation to be allowed?—I think so, if it is fair in amount. There is no reason why a man who loses his business should not be compensated.

3475. When did the town council complete the purchases and clear the ground?—In March 1879, and then they offered it for sale.

3476. Have you got the plan and conditions of sale?—Yes.

3477. Will you put in the conditions of sale?—Yes. (*The same were handed in.*)

3478. Have you seen the conditions of sale issued by the Metropolitan Board of Works?—No, I have not.

3479. I believe that you could not find a purchaser for that ground for the purposes of artizans' dwellings?—No, we tried every means, and we had no offers at all.

3480. What was the highest offer you had?—I do not think we had any really direct offers.

3481. I believe after that you applied to the Local Government Board for a modified scheme?—Yes.

3482. Have you the application that you made?—I have the order they made.

3483. Will you just read the clause of the Act of 1875 under which you made the application?—It is section 12: "The confirming authority, on application from the local authority, and on its being proved to their satisfaction that an improvement can be made in the details of any scheme, and that due provision has been made or secured for the accommodation in suitable dwellings of as many persons of the working class as may be displaced in the area to which such

Chairman—continued.

scheme relates, either in the manner provided by the scheme or in some other manner, or will be more advantageously made or secured under the proposed alteration, may permit the local authority to modify any part of an improvement scheme authorised by the confirming Act which it may appear inexpedient to carry into execution in accordance with such Act." And then this has to be laid before Parliament, and the proviso is, that it shall not require a larger public expenditure than that sanctioned by the former scheme.

3484. You made an application under that clause to the Local Government Board?—To the Local Government Board, and the essence of that is in the last recital: "And whereas the sanitary authority for the said urban sanitary district of Liverpool have made application to the Local Government Board as the 'confirming authority' aforesaid, for a modification of the said improvement scheme under the abovementioned sections, and the said Board are satisfied that equally convenient accommodation can be provided for the persons of the working class displaced by the said improvement scheme at some place other than within the area or the immediate vicinity of the area comprised in the scheme, and the said Board are also satisfied that the required accommodation has been provided. Now therefore we, the Local Government Board, do hereby permit the modification of the said scheme by the said urban sanitary authority by the omission from such scheme of all words which require the urban sanitary authority to provide for the erection of dwelling for persons of the working classes on the area comprised in the said improvement scheme."

3485. In the evidence which you presented to the Local Government Board did you show what, previously to the filling up of the gap, had been done by the general public?—Yes, in the general process of building artizans' dwellings.

3486. The general process of building had been so large that there was ample accommodation for these people?—Yes.

3487. Within what area?—Not within a mile; but Liverpool is growing northwards, you may say, and they have a very large extension of that kind northwards, and there have been a large number of labourers' dwellings built; some hundreds more than are necessary for this district.

3488. How far distant do you say?—A mile.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3489. Not within a mile, you say?—No.

3490. How much further?—Within a mile and a half.

Chairman.

3491. In consequence of the extension on the north into Bootle, are not the people leaving the other end of the town?—The labourers are gradually moving northwards; it is not that they are all going, but there is a gradual tendency of labour towards the north end.

3492. In consequence of the great extension of the railway system and the new docks?—Mainly the docks.

3493. The Provisional Order was made, and it was sanctioned by Parliament, was it not?—I suppose so.

Chairman—continued.

3494. What use have you put this particular spot to?—It is put at present to no use at all, except as a depôt of the Health Committee, for their building materials and paving stones. There has been some little dissatisfaction from its being left so long undisposed of. I believe to-morrow, or the next day, there is to be a special motion in the Council to appoint a committee to see whether there cannot be something done with it. There is a question whether it would not do for a wholesale fish market; that has nothing to do with this scheme; it is since it was relieved from the conditions of this scheme.

3495. What was the total net cost, after completing the sale of old materials, and excluding rents?—Excluding rents on one side and interest upon the other, the total net expenditure was 67,166 *l.* Then the Corporation have 16,853 square yards of land for sale out of a total of 22,487 yards.

3496. What have you done with the other?—The balance is devoted to new streets.

3497. You take off from the 22,487 yards enough to make new streets, and that leaves 16,853?—Yes.

3498. What is the estimate for that?—For commercial or other purposes, 2 *l.* a yard; equal to 33,706 *l.*, leaving a net cost of improvements of 33,460 *l.*, which is much less than was estimated at the beginning.

3499. Your estimate was 62,000 *l.*?—Yes.

3500. You told us that your gross estimate was 92,000 *l.*?—Yes.

3501. How did you arrive at that conclusion?—I think that the estimate was made by the engineer; not by our surveyor or valuer. The engineer is the officer of the Health Committee; I think he over estimated the cost of the property.

3502. He turned out to be wrong?—Yes, but it is much more satisfactory than being the other way. It only cost half of what we thought it would cost.

3503. You would be very glad, would you not, to have the provisions of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1875, incorporated into your general police law?—What I should like to see, and what our Municipal Association asked me to prepare, and what I have in hand now, is a Streets Improvement Clauses Act, following upon the lines of this Act, to be incorporated in every improvement Bill. One point in which it would require to be altered is this, that you would have to provide for compulsory sale. The reason why it is disallowed in this case is that the property was thought to be insanitary, and that, therefore, the owner was not entitled to the allowance.

3504. What you really want is the machinery of this Act applied to all your street improvement purposes, but still you would like to retain this Act for the unhealthy areas, because you get rid of the ten per cent.?—We do get rid of that, but we have other machinery for the unhealthy areas, which we can put in operation now; but as regards street improvements, I cannot imagine a greater good that can be done than to have better machinery for assessing compensation. It is becoming so bad, that I would

Chairman—continued.

I would advise our Corporation to stop street improvements altogether, because of the excessive compensation.

3505. What is the percentage of loss in any ordinary street improvements?—I cannot say, but we do get something by the sale of surplus lands; not much. The tribunal is very unsatisfactory.

3506. We have been told, I think, by the officers of the Metropolitan Board of Works, that the loss on street improvements amounts to between 70 and 75 per cent.?—I should think it would be so in Liverpool.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3507. Is that for widening streets, or making new streets?—Either. Sometimes very great litigation arises from these cases, which is very expensive. I had a case a little while ago, where a person bought a property which was scheduled, and which we were just going to buy; that led to a great deal of litigation. The claimant gave 4,000 *l.* for the property, with the understanding that he should share any more that he got than the 4,000 *l.* We appointed our arbitrator, and he appointed his; the two did not agree upon an umpire; our arbitrator was charged with refusing to act, and the consequence of that was, that the other arbitrator who had just been a claimant against the Corporation, said he would make an *ex parte* award. We contested this point before the magistrates, and insisted upon an independent umpire being appointed; notwithstanding that, he made an *ex parte* award for 4,600 *l.* We got Sir Henry Hunt appointed as umpire. He made his award for 3,800 *l.*, and they tried to upset Sir Henry Hunt's award, on the ground that it was not made in time: however, it stood. I mention that as an instance of the trouble and cost there is in connection with the cases of individual tribunals.

Chairman.

3508. You are of opinion, I understand, that if this machinery was so applied, it would reduce the compensation payable by more than 25 per cent.?—I think it would. We should get a thoroughly competent tribunal, and he would have a full opportunity of checking the valuers in a way that he cannot possibly do now. Sir Henry Hunt, when he was down upon the artizans' scheme, was there for a week or ten days, and when instances of value were set up in his court he had an opportunity of seeing for himself whether they were really instances, or whether they were not contrasts; and in that way he checked the valuations given, which were sometimes extravagant.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3509. In the other case there might be a separate jury in each case?—Yes.

3510. Having no reference to one another, and not being allowed to know what is being given in other cases?—Yes, except what may be said in court at the moment.

Chairman.

3511. If you do away with the provisional award would you give any appeal after the final award is made?—Yes, I would; the same appeal as is given by the Artizans' Dwellings Act, with this exception, that instead of appealing to the sheriff's court, I should appeal to the Assize Court, and set it down as a cause at the assizes, and let it be tried by a special jury, with a judge presiding over it: at present the appeal is to the sheriff's court, but that is not a good tribunal.

3512. In all questions of valuing of that kind, the judge is very anxious to leave it to the sheriff, is he not?—No; the cases would be so few. There is a strong safeguard, by making the parties pay the costs if they do not get any more than they were originally awarded.

3513. What do you think of the limit of 500 *l.*; is that a proper limit?—Yes. There is no necessity for any appeal below that.

3514. At Liverpool you have an arbitrator named in the first instance, have you not, in the case of street improvements?—Yes, by the Local Government Board.

3515. Do you think it right that the Local Government Board should have the right to appoint arbitrators for all street improvements throughout the country?—Yes, I think so, subject to an appeal in cases above 500 *l.* Some of the Board of Trade arbitrators who are on the Board of Trade cases, whom the Local Government Board send down, are the best men in England for those cases; they are a far better tribunal than a jury just summoned for the day.

3516. How many labouring people were residing upon the Nash-grove area, which you dealt with?—The scheme shows that the number of persons of the working classes to be displaced on the said area would be 1,100.

3517. About 200 families, in fact?—Yes.

3518. How many separate houses?—About the same number.

3519. Are there many working people living in the immediate neighbourhood of that district?—Yes.

3520. But have any fresh houses been found for them?—No.

3521. Is there a tendency in that neighbourhood for the working people's houses to be got rid of?—No, not just there; it has not got so near as that.

3522. There is no natural process of gradually superseding working men's houses?—No; near the Exchange commercial buildings are gradually displacing the dwellings.

3523. You found that you could not sell this land under any condition for the erection of artizans' dwellings?—No, not at anything like a price.

3524. What price could you have sold at?—Sixteen or eighteen shillings a square yard.

3525. Instead of 2 *l.*?—Yes.

3526. You could have sold it at that price?—Yes, but the loss would have been very serious.

3527. Could you have sold it at that price?—Yes, we probably could have sold it at 16 *s.* or 18 *s.*

3528. But you did not think it reasonable that the town should incur that very great loss?—No; we thought it better to get the restriction removed.

3529. I understood you to say, in answer to the honourable Chairman, that you could not sel it at all?—It was scarcely worth thinking of.

Chairman.

3530. If you sold it at 16 *s.* you would have lost what you originally calculated you would lose?—Yes, I meant that there was no offer made which would compare with what it would fetch if it had been offered for commercial purposes.

Mr *Shaw-Lefevre.*

3531. Were you prepared to incur a certain loss?—Yes.

3532. To what extent?—I can only give an estimate; the Corporation went into the scheme upon strong recommendations from their medical officer.

3533. You said you contemplated some other machinery for dealing with these unhealthy areas?—I was alluding to our own local machinery.

3534. What is that?—That is comprised in the Sanitary Amendment Act of 1864, which has been amended from time to time; and I can tell you what the process was, and how it has been improved. The original process was this, at first the medical officer of health reports that premises are unfit for human habitation, and states his grounds. Then the report of the medical officer of health is signed in duplicate, and sent to the town clerk and the clerk of the peace for the city. The council then consider the report, and ask that it may be taken into consideration by the grand jury at the sessions; it is laid before the grand jury at the sessions, who make a presentment as to the way in which these houses should be altered in order to remove the objections of the medical officer of health.

3535. Does this process enable you to take the houses under compulsion?—Yes; the engineer has to value them and prepare plans and specifications; then he gives notice to the town clerk that the plans and specifications are prepared; and then the town clerk gives notice to the owners of the property. The owners of the property have a right of appeal against the presentment, and if they do not appeal, they must either effect the improvement themselves or the Corporation will effect them.

3536. Have you power enabling you to buy the property?—We can take property compulsorily, but we have to go to a jury to assess the value in each case.

3537. So far as you have yet gone the provisions are in the direction of enabling you to effect improvement?—Yes, in this way. The problem to be solved is this; how are you to improve property through which streets have been made, and on which buildings have been erected, when there was no law to regulate them, in the most economical manner? Our presentment Act enables us to do it in a more economical manner than the Artizans' Dwellings Act, because it enables us not to sweep the whole away, but to make certain alterations, which when they are made will put the property substantially in the position in which it would be if it were built now.

3538. That is a process analogous rather to that under Mr. Torrens's Act than that under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—Except that Mr. Torrens's Act provided for the rebuilding of houses; that has never been put in force in Liverpool. I can show you the plan of one of these presentments (*producing it*).

Mr. *Shaw-Lefevre*—continued.

3539. You have power under your Act of either compelling owners to do it or to do it yourselves, have you not?—Yes.

3540. Supposing you think property in such a state that even that process is not appropriate, have you power to take it compulsorily?—Yes.

3541. The whole of it?—I should doubt it. The power is to some extent in the hands of the grand jury at the sessions; but we have never attempted to take the whole.

3542. Is there any provision that in the event of your taking property compulsorily, you are under an obligation to rebuild artizans' dwellings on it?—No.

3543. I understand you do not contemplate working in that direction?—Not at all.

3544. What you propose is, to work under the earlier part of the machinery you mentioned, namely, to compel improvements, or make improvements yourselves, leaving the houses substantially in the occupation of the people who are now in them?—Yes.

3545. And you think the powers given you under these clauses are wider than those given under what is known as Torrens's Act?—Yes.

3546. And more effective?—Yes. We have never put Torrens's Act in force, so I am not familiar with it. Our own Act was passed in 1864, and Mr. Torrens's Act was not passed until 1868. Since then we have improved our Act.

3547. You think, under the provisions you speak of, you can effect all your objects without working further under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—In most cases. I will not say that there might not be a block of very bad property where it is desirable to take the whole away.

3548. Are there any areas which you think you will be compelled to deal with under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwelling Act?—We have had one under our consideration, but it is such an immense area that the Corporation will try the effect of their own Act as it is amended, and as it will be further amended, during the present Session.

3549. You will endeavour to operate under your own powers before you put in force the larger powers of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act?—Yes, it is a large number of acres.

3550. How many acres?—Thirty-eight acres; the expense of sweeping away the whole of that will be enormous.

3551. What is the defect there now?—The streets are narrower than they would be allowed to be if now formed; the houses, instead of having 150 square feet for every house for ventilation, are built in narrow courts, and the entrances are under narrow covered ways in some places.

3552. How could that be amended under your scheme?—Sometimes they knock two houses down out of ten, or one out of eight, as the case may be, to give ventilation and circulation of air.

3553. Is this property in a part of the town where the land is very valuable, or how is it?—No, this is the south end of the town. The whole area of this originally belonged to Lord Sefton; his agent laid it out. They are good wide streets round, but they did not take equal precautions

Mr. *Shaw-Lefevre*—continued.

precautions as to intersecting streets, and some of the streets are only 20 feet wide.

3554. I understand that you do not contemplate any considerable action under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?—No, we have this under consideration now; and I should tell you in what respects our Act has been improved. Our Act was subject to the faults that I have been mentioning about street improvements generally; that is, if we wanted a house in a court, a man could put us to the expense of nearly 100 *l.* in assessing compensation, and the house might be worth only 60 *l.* Under those circumstances, we had to give twice as much as it was worth; that was where we wanted a single house in a court to ventilate the whole court. Then there was this also, that by taking that house from the man at twice as much as it was worth, we improved the remainder of his houses.

3555. Is there any process by which you can charge upon that man's property, thus increased in value, the increased value given to it by your improvements?—We have gone as near it as possible; we then got a further Provisional Order of the 2nd of May 1879, on which all these cases under one presentment go to one arbitrator, appointed by the Local Government Board, and "in settling the amount of any compensation the estimate of the value of the premises (including the site thereof) shall be based on the fair market value as estimated at the time of the valuation being made of such premises, and of the several interests in such premises, due regard being had to the nature and then condition of the property, and the probable duration of the buildings in their existing state, and to the state of repair thereof, and all circumstances affecting such value, without any additional allowance in respect of the compulsory purchase of such premises; and the arbitrator shall have regard to and make allowance in respect of any increased value which, in his opinion, will be given to other premises of the same owner by the alteration or demolition, by the Corporation, of the premises altered or demolished."

3556. Supposing the same owner owned both fairly good and bad property, if in effecting improvements through one property you increased the value of his other property, are you able to take that into account in awarding him compensation?—As regards want of ventilation it is generally all bad; the whole court is bad, but by knocking out two houses the remainder of the houses are much improved.

3557. It may be all a bad property, but if, by effecting particular improvements and knocking down one or two houses, you add to the value of the remainder, may you take that into consideration?—Yes.

3558. Supposing the whole to be in the hands of two different owners, then you cannot assess upon the owner of the adjoining property, even though it be improved in value, the additional value which accrues to it?—No.

3559. Did you ever hear of a process in the American law known as the "betterment" clauses?—I have seen a Statute of New York State which enabled you to charge the whole cost upon the other owners.

Mr. *Shaw-Lefevre*—continued.

3560. To the extent of the improved value given to them?—Yes.

3561. Is that a principle which in your opinion ought to be adopted in all street improvements?—No, I do not think so.

3562. Does not what you have said go nearly as far as that?—No; here it is the same owner to whom you are going to pay the money, and who is himself benefited. It is a very different thing when you charge a man whose property you do not touch.

3563. Surely the principle is the same?—Not quite. The whole of that gain, I think, which is given by the American Statute, would be fairly met by giving you a reasonable latitude in scheduling property for street improvements, giving a new frontage.

3564. So that you might take a larger frontage?—Yes.

3565. Is there considerable strictness in our law or practice in that matter?—No, Parliament is very liberal now; cases have been fought upon that subject. In the Deansgate Improvement, in Manchester, which is the last case, I gave evidence in the House of Lords in favour of that principle, and they got their Bill.

3566. It is rather in practice than in the law that you would consider that greater latitude ought to be given; that is, in the practice of the local authority scheduling larger areas?—Parliament gives a larger area, and they can recoup themselves to a certain extent.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3567. You seem to have no difficulty in providing new habitations for the persons displaced by this scheme?—It was the general progress of building that provided them; the Corporation did not do anything at all.

3568. Did the Corporation interest themselves in finding new habitations?—No.

3569. But the persons themselves found them?—Yes.

3570. That of course was necessary before you were able to apply to the Local Government Board for a new Provisional Order for the relaxation of your restriction?—Yes; the houses had been built in the interval between the granting of our Provisional Order and the period when we applied to the Local Government Board.

3571. Therefore you have not considered the question as to how far we should either keep in full force or relax the restriction that now exists, about finding accommodation for the persons who are displaced?—Except in London. I should not like to speak about London, where the circumstances are very peculiar, but there is no provincial town where it might not be safely dispensed with.

3572. You think the people would find habitations for themselves?—Yes.

Chairman.

3573. You would be content to leave it to the Local Government Board if such were the case?—Yes.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3574. Sir Henry Hunt, we have been told, dealt very liberally with weekly tenants; did he do

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

do that with the concurrence of your Corporation?—Yes, we did not object.

Mr. *Cropper.*

3575. Have you much overcrowding in Liverpool?—We have a great deal of overcrowding of houses, but not much overcrowding by families in each house. That plan which I have shown is an instance of a great many more houses in a certain space than there ought to be.

3576. But in London we find that when such alterations are made, the result is that the people crowd more closely into the surrounding houses; you have not found it so?—It may be so in London; I can quite understand that it would be so where a man would lose his means of obtaining a livelihood by moving to a distance.

3577. Do you usually find that the tenants are just as near their work when they move away as when they retain their houses?—Yes; it requires a little time for things to settle themselves. Then I have mentioned already that there is a development northwards.

3578. Have you had any great complaint by the medical officer of overcrowding?—Not of overcrowding of each house.

3579. I think you got rid of the cellars that there used to be in Liverpool?—Yes; we got rid of the cellars, and we also got rid, by making stringent bye-laws as to the sub-letting of houses, of a great deal of overcrowding of individual houses.

3580. A great deal of your work was done by your bye-laws, was it not?—Yes, a great deal was done in that way. I think we spent 100,000 *l.* under this Local Act of 1864.

3581. And how much under the Act which we are now discussing?—The net cost of this scheme will be 33,000 *l.*

3582. And will your future schemes be under this Act?—I could not undertake to say that.

3583. You contemplate that, do you not?—I think our future schemes will be under our own Act as amended; we are amending it a little this Session, in this way, that where we find that the medical officer reports that the parties are willing to negotiate and sell their property for a reasonable sum, we may carry out the improvement without going to the grand jury at all.

3584. Do you know any houses which have been shut up under Mr. Torrens's Act, the Nuisances Removal Act?—No, it is not put in force in Liverpool at all.

Mr. *Brodrick.*

3585. As regards compensation, I do not understand what you consider is fair to be paid for insanitary dwellings which have to be pulled down?—I should think that what Sir Henry Hunt allowed was about 12 years' purchase, or something like that; that is, assuming the property would pay 7½ per cent., 12 years' purchase on the net rental.

3586. You fix your payment not merely by the ground-rent, but by the rent fixed for the house?—Yes.

3587. You have told the honourable Member for Reading that you did not think it fair to assess the surrounding houses for the increased value arising from the improvement?—No.

Mr. *Brodrick*—continued.

3588. Supposing the surrounding houses are in such an insanitary condition that you could not leave them standing unless you removed the others, it would surely be fair in that case to charge them?—I do not think we have any right to charge people for improving their property against their will; they must benefit, like the inhabitants generally, without paying for it.

3589. Do you consider that the exercise of your powers, under the Acts mentioned, has brought much influence to bear upon private owners in the way of improvement?—No, I do not think so. Of course, now the private owners are compelled to build according to our bye-laws, and no insanitary property is built; it was only the old property that was built in this way before there was any law to compel them to build properly.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3590. Upon the passing of the Act of 1864 I suppose your sanitary officers reported here and there a great many houses as being in an unsatisfactory state?—Yes, we have had six presentments altogether from time to time.

3591. How many sanitary officers have you altogether in Liverpool?—Only the medical officer and his assistants, and the inspector of nuisances, the ordinary officers of an urban sanitary authority. We have one officer for the whole city.

3592. Did he report from different districts simultaneously?—Yes.

3593. As I understand, your action is that when you have a bad tooth you pull it out, and do not require an artificial substitute for the whole set?—Yes, we think this Act is a little too drastic in its operation; it is exceedingly simple, but very expensive.

3594. I think Mr. Graves was your Member at the time that Act was carried out?—Yes.

3595. He gave us a great deal of information, did he not, when drawing the Act of 1868?—Yes.

3596. Where you pull down or obtain the right to purchase to pull down, you do not contemplate rebuilding?—No, the Corporation have only built one block of labourers' dwellings; they were not built under these powers, and it was not considered so successful as to induce them to repeat the process.

3597. Were your operations under your own Act chiefly in districts in the centre of the town, or districts on the fringe of the town?—They were in the more densely populated parts of the town.

3598. I presume building has been going on these last 20 years in Liverpool all round?—Yes.

3599. Liverpool has been expanding?—Yes.

3600. And that provides for the outgoing of the people displaced in a natural way?—Yes.

3601. And you found no necessity for even considering the question of rebuilding?—No.

Mr. *Francis Buxton.*

3602. You stated that you were well satisfied with the arbitration of Sir Henry Hunt, and with his decision as to value?—Yes. There was only one case in which we were dissatisfied; it was not a case of taking property; it was a case

of

Mr. *Francis Buxton*—continued.

of injuriously affecting property, in which he gave what we thought a considerable sum, and we found it impossible to move his opinion when we presented our case to him, and he did not alter his provisional award in that case.

3603. Upon the whole he gave great satisfaction?—Yes.

3604. You did not find any objection to the fact of his being a London man and ignorant of the requirements of Liverpool?—Not at all; but he constantly comes to Liverpool in various cases as umpire and arbitrator.

3605. Then he is acquainted with the circumstances of the place?—Yes, but I do not think it makes any difference; a man who is competent to value property in London is competent to value anywhere.

3606. Is it competent to the authority to name anyone they please?—It is.

3607. But there was no feeling of dissatisfaction in your having nominated a London man?—No.

3608. You say the area that was cleared is still clear?—Yes; a main street has been made through a great part of it, but it is used now as a depôt for materials for the sanitary authority.

3609. In that case, did you put it up for sale as long ago as 1879?—Yes.

3610. And it has been in the market ever since?—No; we put it up for sale in 1879 under the special conditions of the Local Government Board.

3611. Now you have relaxed the conditions?—Yes.

3612. But you have not sold it yet?—No, we have not offered it for sale yet, because the question is under consideration whether it would be suitable for a wholesale fish market.

3613. There are special circumstances in that case?—Yes, but the special circumstances ceased in May 1880, when the restriction was withdrawn.

3614. And notwithstanding the fact that that area has remained unbuilt upon since 1879. Do you consider that the operation of the Act has been very beneficial to Liverpool?—Yes, certainly.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3615. Do you find any difficulty in getting the Corporation to agree under your own Act?—No.

3616. Has it been suggested that personal interests may stand in the way of dealing with these courts?—No, there has never been any suggestion of that sort. We found the machinery of our Act of 1864 work in the way I have described, disadvantageously, because of the enormous cost which a man could put you to if you did not give his price.

3617. Where you pull down a house or two in a court and displace a family in each house, there is no great cause of anxiety as to their finding room elsewhere, is there?—No.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3618. I presume that, having reference to the principle which the Local Government Board acknowledged in relieving you from the obligation of re-building upon this area, there is no area in Liverpool, now occupied by artizans' dwellings, in an insanitary condition, where you would be compelled to build artizans' dwellings?—I should not think that if we had another scheme, supposing the Act were altered, it would impose a restriction.

3619. The same principle upon which they let you off by that relaxation would act in any other case?—Yes, if they had power.

3620. And probably within a mile or a mile and a-half of Liverpool there would be a place where the artizans could be removed to?—Yes, it is more difficult in the south than in the north, because in the south there is not so much building going on as in the north.

Chairman.

3621. Supposing you took the 32-acre block, and that you were sitting upon the Local Government Board yourself, you would probably relax the provisions to a certain extent, but would impose some restriction as to building?—In dealing with that immense area, if it were swept away at once there would be a difficulty. It could only be dealt with piecemeal. You could not deal with it all at once, otherwise you would cause great hardships.

Monday, 1st May 1882.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brodrick.
Mr. Francis Buxton.
Mr. Cropper.
Sir Richard Cross.
Sir Henry Holland.
Mr. John Hollond.
Mr. William Holms.
Mr. Shaw Lefevre.
Sir James M'Garel-Hogg.
Mr. Rankin.
Sir Matthew Ridley.
Mr. Torrens.
Sir Sydney Waterlow.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR RICHARD CROSS, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. FREDERICK WILLIAM GODDARD, called in; and further Examined.

Chairman.

3622. THE last time you were before us, I ventured to make some suggestions as to the way we might deal with the three cases which were pressed upon us under the Metropolitan Streets Improvement Act, and you undertook, on behalf of the Board, to take those suggestions under consideration, and see what proposition you could make to us upon them when we next met. Now, I take first of all the Gray's Inn-road improvement; you had better first state the number of people who will be displaced, and tell us how you propose to meet that case?—The number, including children, appears, by a tabulated statement we have recently made, to amount to 1,930. I have had a very careful, and I believe, an exceedingly accurate investigation made as to not only the number of people, but the trades in which they are employed; the distances of their employment from their habitations, those who are employed upon the spot, and others who are merely casuals, sometimes here and sometimes there; and I have this table as the result. These are all the details; they are so many that I hardly think you will have them put in. The persons in fixed employment within one mile radius of Baldwin's-gardens, Gray's Inn-road, are 1,155, and we propose to accommodate the entire of those, and we have made arrangements for 59 more, making 1,200 upon the blocks there. What is coloured pink is that which is thrown into the road; what is coloured yellow is the building land 50 feet deep, the remainder are the artizans' dwellings. Persons in fixed employment beyond one mile radius of Baldwin's-gardens, Gray's Inn-road, 180. Persons with no settled employment and out of work, those are men who go hop picking, casuals and so on 595, making a total of 1,930. Then we have made arrangements by five-storied buildings to accommodate 1,200, and the rest, we consider, might find accommodation in other parts of the metropolis.

3263. Now, will you tell us what prospect there will be, supposing Parliament were to give you this relaxation in accommodating speedily the persons who would be turned out, and getting these places built over while you are going on with your street?—The same method as we have adopted in the particulars of sale which I think you have before you, would, I apprehend, be adopted by the Board here; they would clear the sites and put them up by auction, and sell them at the best price they could realise for them.

Chairman—continued.

3624. At once?—Yes, we put up six on Friday last, and we sold five out of the six, and I think I see the representative of the company that bought them.

3625. What would be the reduction in cost to the Metropolitan Board of Works if we were to adopt the scheme you propose?—The loss would be half as much; we should have 50 feet of depth of commercial frontage to deal with all along, and we should not have to sacrifice it at the price we get for artizans' dwellings. It would be slightly affected by reason of the artizans' dwellings being behind; it would not be quite of so much value as if it was unconnected, but still there would be a larger recuperation.

3626. Then as to the time; you are tied by a particular section of the present Act, only to take down 15 houses at a time; how would you wish us to suggest that we should deal with that part of the section?—In that case, so far as the commercial part was concerned, we should have an opportunity of clearing it off, and so far as the other goes, you might divide it into two sections without difficulty.

3627. Should you object to our insisting that one particular block behind should be pulled down and sold, so that you might begin to rebuild before you begin to pull down the rest?—No, I do not think we should object to that.

Sir *Henry Holland.*

3628. In your answer to Question 1693, you said you thought you had not sufficient depth to build those dwelling-houses at the back of the houses facing Gray's Inn-lane?—Yes.

3629. Have you reconsidered it and found that there is sufficient, or do you assume more land will be taken?—No, I have taken a little more land, as you will see, next our limits of deviation;

Sir *Henry Holland*—continued.

deviation; it is about four houses, but I have limited it to 50 feet instead of 60, that made a material difference. I found I could do with 50 feet, but I could do better with 60 feet.

Mr. *John Hollond.*

3630. As to the number of houses you pull down at a time, do I understand you divide this into two sections, and clear one section containing about 1,000 population, and then another?—One thousand nine hundred and thirty is the total.

3631. In point of fact, you would make a clearance which would dislodge, I dare say, nearly 1,000 persons at a time?—Yes, but out of the 1,000, you have only 500 who are absolutely resident in the place continuously, because the other is a proportion of those who are here to-day and gone to-morrow.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3632. Do I understand you to say with reference to the Gray's Inn-road improvement, that the only additional piece of land that you could take beyond the limits of deviation is that building in Elm-street?—Yes.

3633. Will you tell me the width of the dark blue. I presume it represents the blocks of buildings?—Yes, they are 30 feet each one.

3634. You propose that the blocks should be 30 feet deep, and the light blue represents the space for light and air behind?—Yes.

3635. In each case?—Yes.

3636. Have you in setting out the dark blue looked to the neighbouring roads to see whether it is possible to build upon that which is indicated dark blue?—We have had regard to the adjoining roads and houses.

3637. Inasmuch as it would take at least 18 months to build upon any of the land which you may sell for this purpose, would it be practicable, and are the Board prepared, not to pull down the front until the new buildings are erected?—I have asked that the Board may be allowed to pull down that which is dedicated to commercial purposes at once, and I have asked that the land at the back may be taken in two sections.

3638. If you follow that course of action that you propose, you more practically take down more than three-fifths of the whole, before you begin to erect at all, because the part dedicated to commercial purposes is occupied by many persons whom I gather from your own statement, are engaged in the neighbourhood, and then you would take down more than half, and, indeed, three-fourths of the whole would be taken down before any buildings were up?—No, there are some, of course, over the shops in Gray's Inn-road occupying tenemental lodgings, but the majority are those behind; the denser population are those in Baldwin's-gardens, Verulam-street, and so on.

3639. Take the land between Portpool-lane and Verulam-street, is not the part dedicated to commercial purposes largely occupied; you see a court intersects it?—One side of it is not occupied at all, it is vacant ground; the other side is occupied by the working classes, but then in addition to that, you have taken the best selection for my purpose that you could, because the yard, No. 200, is only tenented by cows, there are no people there.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

3640. Then do you tell the Committee that if you take down the whole of the yellow, dedicated to commercial purposes, and then the section of blue, you will not take three-fourths of this property?—No.

Chairman.

3641. I understand that you propose to take one section of blue down first?—Yes.

3642. So that that may be built upon?—Yes, I take half the section of that which is in future to be dedicated to artizans' dwellings in two sections, and the other section, the front, could be taken as one thing.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3643. What I want to impress upon you is, whether it is not possible to pull down one section of that which is to be dedicated to artizans' dwellings, and get it up before you pull down that part dedicated to commercial purposes, because the part dedicated to commercial purposes is the frontage of the street, which can go on being occupied while the rear is being dealt with?—The moment we compensate the tenants of the shops, they naturally look out for other places to remove to, and if you do it in that way you will have the ugly shut up shops, getting very dilapidated in appearance, fronting Gray's Inn-road, continuing for some time.

3644. Of course, but that would be the way not to do it; the way would be not to compensate the shopkeepers until you took the property in the rear and cleared it and sold it, and it could be dealt with?—The greater part are compensated at the present moment.

Chairman.

3645. How do you propose to deal with it?—I propose to be allowed to remove one half of that which is coloured red and dark blue, and I should commence there; then I propose to be allowed to pull down that which is in front of it, so that it may run simultaneously. Originally I thought of pulling the entire frontage down, therefore, if you give us permission to carry one section of the Act out at once, we might reserve the other section, and deal with the frontage commercially, first section to Liquorpond-street, second section to Elm-street.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3646. Do you mean to leave Gray's Inn-road as it is now?—No, to pull it down at once as far as Liquorpond-street.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3647. Could not you deal with the deep part and get it cleared, and get the buildings up before you clear so much of the ground. If you carry out your present suggestion, you would have three-fourths uncovered at the same time?—The moment the land is in the market, such are the applications for it at the present moment, that the commercial portion of that land will not remain uncovered three months

Mr. *Torrens.*

3648. Will you explain to the Committee the gaps which there are already between what you have cleared at the new town hall; there are three or four huge gaps there?—There is the erection of the town hall upon the site which I have marked in pencil; then the houses are pulled down up as far as the public-house called the "Brown Bull."

3649. How many are pulled down?—Three houses. Then there are houses shut up at this corner; and the public house called the "Red Lion," which the Board have nearly completed purchasing, and they anticipate taking it round this corner when they have widened Portpool-lane.

3650. What are the two extremes?—It is between Verulam-street and Baldwin's-gardens; they were burnt down. The Board want to buy this property before they re-erect them, and we have not been able to do anything with them prior to our being able to pull them down ourselves.

3651. Will you explain to me the destruction of trade and the desolation in the houses still standing in consequence of their ruinous condition and contiguity?—That is why I would give the Board power to pull down and rebuild.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3652. On account of the complaints of the neighbourhood repeated over and over again?—Yes.

Chairman.

3653. Did you ever try to sell the part devoted to artizans' dwellings with the building materials just as they are?—It would be utterly impossible; the building materials are so saturated with disease and filth as to be completely useless.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3654. Is it not the fact that the broken bricks and mortar, and that kind of material, are really ground in a mill and used with lime for fresh mortar?—I am not speaking of that. I thought you meant using bricks as entire bricks for rebuilding; as to grinding up and so on, they can be used for that purpose.

3655. Would not the loss be less if you sold the land with the materials; would not the sale of the materials very frequently cover the cost of removal?—Yes, but persons would not give as much for bricks to grind up on the spot, and for firewood to pull out merely to make bonfires; men buy the timber of the floors, and in some of the old houses in Gray's Inn-lane the oak scantlings come out as firm and as good as when they were put in in the reign of James the First, and the people buy them to turn to other purposes; but you would not find them give you a fraction more for the ground with the materials upon it.

Chairman.

3656. You think it wiser for the Board to clear the ground first and to sell it as vacant ground?—Yes; there would be intense complaint as to the operation of the Board if they were to give power of utilising the materials in

Chairman—continued.

any way. People would say, if you give us the power of using them in one way, surely you have no objection to our using them for our foundations and so on.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3657. It would add to the difficulty in letting the land you think?—Yes.

Chairman.

3658. If this arrangement is sanctioned by the Committee, upon behalf of the Board, you would undertake that this part of the land for artizans' dwellings should be cleared at once without any delay?—Yes.

3659. And sold?—Yes.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3660. As far as we could do so?—Yes.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3661. What will be the financial results of the proposal; do you consider that it will relieve the Board very much?—The loss will be considerably less than when we had to devote the entirety to artizans' dwellings; it will be lessened one-third.

Chairman.

3662. When do you think you could get it all done if we asked Parliament to sanction this proposal of yours?—We could not promise you that we could get that street done before the close of the autumnal recess.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3663. That is the frontage that you are speaking of, is it not?—I am speaking now of the artizans' dwellings portion, and the other we could carry through by the 25th of December.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3664. Are you sure that that could be done; have you taken into account all the law work that has to be done?—I am looking at it in that point of view. I am looking at the number of cases which we have already settled, those that are in progress of settling, and the outstanding things in the solicitor's office; but I think that if extra pressure was put upon us we might get it through by the end of the year.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3665. With regard to the law expenses, I think you told the Committee that most of those were arranged?—The Committee may understand me thus: there are two processes by which compensation cases are arranged; first, they are referred to the department that I represent to settle them; then they go upstairs for the completion of title in the solicitor's office, and the greater portion of the compensations for trade in this way have been settled, and only await the compensation being arranged by the solicitors.

3666. What

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3666. What is the depth that you propose for commercial purposes?—Fifty feet.

3667. Do I understand you to say that 1,930 persons were resident upon the land to be cleared; you have answered that only 577 were actually employed within a mile?—One thousand one hundred and fifty-five are employed within a mile, and we have accommodated 1,200.

3668. That is to say, 1,155 including the families?—Yes.

3669. And your present scheme provides for 1,200?—Our present scheme provides for 1,200. I have the returns here of the employment of the women and children and every individual throughout the whole place.

Mr. *Cropper.*

3670. Sir Sydney Waterlow suggested a scheme to you, but from what I understand the effect of that scheme would be the immense delay that it would create before the whole of the works in the new road are completed?—Yes.

3671. You said that it would be something like three years?—Probably.

3672. On the other hand, if your plan is approved by Parliament the result would be accomplished in about half the time?—Yes.

3673. Therefore we should have the whole advantage of the new dwellings and new shops and everything else a year sooner by your scheme than by the other?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3674. And the parish would have the advantage of the rates?—Yes.

Chairman.

3675. Will you now go to the second scheme; what do you call it?—The second scheme that we talked of was the larger scheme of Metropolitan improvements, Charing Cross to Oxford-street, and Piccadilly to Oxford-street, the Western Improvement Scheme. This is the block coloured blue upon the plans marked by the Home Secretary (*producing a plan*), and devoted to the re-habitation of the industrial classes. Those two sites accommodate 1,470, and we have accommodation for 600 people in the Pye-street, Westminster, Peabody Buildings.

3676. How far is that off?—Within a radius of a mile, and I have made an examination as to how many we really turn out upon this spot, and I find that there are 180 families.

3677. Is that on the two sites?—That is upon the one spot, and taking four children to a family, it would only be 720 people; they do not average above three people; we have given every individual in that block who has removed notice that the Peabody people have 600 vacant places in their buildings specially reserved for them if they choose to apply for them; so that there shall be no complaint that they cannot obtain habitations. Now something has been said with regard to the inhabitants turned out here, and I believe my statement as to their respectability has been rather impugned, but if you wish for any corroboration of what I say, you have only to apply to have Inspector Shepherd of that district before you; you can have the sanitary officer, Dr. Clement Evans, of the Strand Union, to speak of the pestiferous condition of the majority of the dwellings.

Chairman—continued.

3678. What proposal do you make here?—We have to accommodate 5,300 according to the return presented to Parliament.

3679. Is that upon both spots?—That is the two sites; there is a congeries of buildings in Dudley-street, upon this side, which are included in our limits of deviation, but the present intention of the Board is not to disturb them at all, and a very large number of the inhabitants are down in our list for us to provide accommodation, for who will not be disturbed in the slightest degree. I do not think we shall have more than 4,000 people out of the whole 5,000 odd that could claim re-accommodation. We propose accommodating 2,000 of them here.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3680. How will it relieve you?—It will relieve us as to half, and having accommodated half whose work is in immediate relationship with the factories around, tailors' shops, and so on, the others are those who can find accommodation in districts which are not so over-populated as this.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3681. Where are they?—About four miles off.

Chairman.

3682. Have you gone through the particulars of the inhabitants of this space in the same way as you did with regard to the other?—Not with the same precision as the other.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3683. How will that relieve you financially?—Financially, it would be a very awkward thing if you were to say to us that we must devote the whole of this property to the rehabitation of the working classes.

Chairman.

3684. What is your obligation at present?—Our obligation at the present moment is to rehouse 4,000 people; we have got accommodation for 2,000. I am engaged now in the purchase of a piece of ground at Kentish Town that will accommodate another 600, and whether you will permit us to submit one site for the other I do not know.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3685. How far off is that?—Three and a half miles by tramway.

3686. Supposing that your obligation for the remaining 2,000 is retained, what effect will it have upon your liability here?—In our original estimate for this street we only reduced our prices upon the recouping of the land in the two isolated blocks, because we were asked to set aside a certain site for the accommodation of the working classes, and we took those two; we imagined at the time that by setting those sites aside we were answering the requirements made upon us; but if we have to reimpose the whole the estimate will be doubled.

 3687. What

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre*—continued.

3687. What is the estimate now?—The estimate for the two sites is 1,000,000 *l.*

3688. And it will cost you 2,000,000 *l.* if you have to re-house 2,000 more people?—Yes.

Chairman.

3689. That was your estimate under that obligation?—Yes.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3690. If you had to provide for 2,000 more, would the estimate be raised to 2,000,000 *l.* instead of 1,000,000 *l.*?—I put it roughly at that; and as our frontages are so narrow along here for commercial purposes, we shall have great difficulty in reimposing them upon these particular sites.

3691. It is the same question as Gray's Inn-lane over again, namely, if you are compelled to rehouse 2,000 additional people beyond those you speak of, you will be compelled to apply the frontages for that purpose?—Yes.

3692. You will not get the money value of the frontages, and your estimate will be increased by 1,000,000 *l.*, which is nearly 1,000 *l.* a person?—Yes. I cannot exactly state what our estimate will be, but I may tell you that in an approximate neighbourhood close to this we have realised at the rate of nearly 4 *s.* a foot per annum. Now 4 *s.* a foot, as contrasted with what we obtained the other day, which was at the rate of 2 *d.* a foot, is rather a drop.

Chairman.

3693. You make a proposition to be relieved from the obligation which Parliament has imposed upon you?—Yes.

3694. What proposition would you make as regards these two particular blocks which you illustrated; could you get this up before you begin the other part of your scheme?—Yes; the Board would have no objection that those blocks should be covered with buildings before the remainder of the street is swept away. We are proceeding as quickly as we can to deal with this site, to put it in the market in the same way as we did those last week. I apprehend that we shall have no difficulty in covering this; I believe we shall have good competition from other parties besides the one which the honourable Member represents.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3695. Having built these artizans' dwellings, you would apply to these persons living here the same process as you apply to the others; you would offer them this accommodation?—Yes; a part of these buildings are held under covenant to give them pre-letting rights.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3696. Would not the Board be hampered as regards time if we waited till this is covered; our time for carrying out the work would be stopped, and we should have to come to Parliament for further powers; our time would expire before we could possibly manage to get the whole street done; have you thought of that?—Yes, I have thought of that; but I have thought, on the other hand, if you ask for the relief of an obligation now imposed you must give something as a *quid pro quo.*

Chairman.

3697. The same Act that gave you relief would extend your time?—Yes.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3698. Just to narrow the issue, will you tell the Committee how many persons would be accommodated upon the land marked pink as compared with the total number that you are called upon to accommodate?—About one-third; 1,470 as against 4,200.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3699. And 600 you provide for elsewhere?—Yes, in Pye-street.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3700. I understand you to say that a portion of the property within the limits of deviation, upon which you form the calculation of the number to be provided for, is not to be removed; how many persons will not be disturbed?—I have deducted those.

3701. If the Board had the relief which it asked for, would it enter into some covenant to make it part of the scheme that this property should not be taken?—We do not take it.

3702. You would alter the limits of deviation?—We have not the slightest idea of taking it.

3703. If you have power to take it, are you willing to surrender up the power to take it?—That is a matter for the Board's consideration; I could not answer that question.

Chairman.

3704. If the whole foundation upon which you base your new plan were to get the support of the recommendation of the Committee, as it is based upon the fact that you are not going to disturb 1,000 of those people, in the Bill it would have to be stated that they are not to be taken?—The best way would be to give you a plan showing absolutely what the limits are, and then give notice as to the other, that there is no intention of the Board to acquire it for the purpose of that street.

3705. Supposing if you get your relaxation and are only obliged to build upon these two plots for the reduced number, you should not be able to take this land, behind which you have power to take now, and turn these people out without providing accommodation for them?—I think the Board would accede to that. I will, with the permission of the Chairman, give you a plan showing exactly what the Board have taken and what they propose to take, and you will find there that a great many of the houses included in the limits of deviation that have undoubtedly an artizan population, are not to be taken at all.

Sir *James M'Garel Hogg.*

3706. We have been over all this, and can let the Committee see what the Board decided upon their last visit?—Yes.

3707. Supposing

Chairman.

3707. Supposing we agree in principle to the propositions which you make, of course they cannot be carried into effect without an Act of Parliament?—That is so.

3708. Would not the simpler course for you be in each of the three cases to provide a Bill and submit it to the Committee, and if they adopted your proposition, they would recommend that those Bills be passed in Parliament, then we should see the whole thing complete?—Yes.

Mr. *Torrens.*

3709. In your new plan you wish to limit your demolitions as nearly as possible to those required for making your new street?—And to enable us to rebuild upon the frontage.

3710. You do not wish to avail yourselves of the present power of the limits of deviation, feeling that it entails upon you new obligations and difficulties?—Yes; and not only that, but we disturb a greater number than we can accommodate in the same area.

Chairman.

3711. Then you will consider how far it is necessary to have an Act to carry all these propositions into effect, and if you find that an Act is necessary for them, you will let us have a Bill drawn?—The Chairman is here, and I suppose he can undertake it. I have no power to do so.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3712. Do I understand you that in respect of the frontage of these schemes, you have considered their value for commercial purposes is 4*s.* a foot, whereas if sold for artizans' dwellings you make out that they will be worth 2*d.* a foot only?—That is a fact; we put up six sites last Friday; we sold five out of the six, and they realised a fraction over 2*d.* a foot at 20 years' purchase.

3713. What difference would that make financially to the whole scheme?—I will let you know.

Chairman.

3714. Then there was a third plan?—Yes, that was the Great Dover-road to Southwark-bridge communication; this is the plan of it (*producing a plan*). The purple colour represents the block, and the light blue colour represents the spaces for light and air; this is hardly sufficient, and I suggest that we should take the two adjoining houses.

3715. Can you do it without further powers?—We have power, and, further than that, we shall take the blue which is within our limits of deviation. Then I would ask the Committee to grant us permission to make the lower stories into shops, and the first floor should be for the accommodation to the occupiers of the shops, and the upper portion and the backs of these to be devoted to artizans' dwellings. Altogether we disturbed 1,622 of those, and we get accommodation for within 30 of the whole number displaced.

3716. Shall you want an Act of Parliament for that, or if we recommend the Secretary of State to use his dispensing power, would it be enough?—Yes.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3717. You ask that on letting the land, you should let it with the condition that shops should be put upon the ground floor, and that the owners of the shops should occupy the first floor?—Yes.

3718. Is it necessary to extend it to the first floor; having reference to the depth of these blocks generally, would not the rooms upon the ground floor and the basement be sufficient to be occupied by the persons; and may I ask before you answer that question, whether you know that in the houses in the Goswell-road, built six stories high, where there are shops all along the frontage, the rooms are so occupied?—I know the Goswell-road buildings, but I have never been over them internally, but to have only bedroom accommodation at the back of the shop is hardly sufficient for the decencies of life: a man occupying, who would be able to pay 50*l.* or 60*l.* a-year for his shop, ought to have a room or two rooms for his wife and children as well as for himself.

3719. I agree with you, but you would have found at Goswell-street three or four rooms at the back of the shop?—If accommodation can be given in that way, it would do; but in planning this out, I thought it better to give the first floor for that accommodation.

3720. I believe also that some portion of the land originally belonging to the Board, where there are shops upon the ground floor in Cromwell Buildings, out of New Southwark-street, have three or four rooms in the rear of the first floor, and the two floors are occupied in that way?—We can accommodate within 30 of the number displaced.

Chairman.

3721. Now as to the time, should you propose to do this in two sections, because you must remember the obligation as to the 15 houses?—It might be done in two sections.

3722. One side of the street at one time, and one at another?—Yes.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3723. These buildings are within a quarter of a mile of the Mint-street site, are they not?—Close to it.

Chairman.

3724. How far are these from the new buildings of Mr. Dodds, the site of the Old Queen's Bench prison?—It would be about a quarter of a mile.

3725. So that there is ample accommodation there?—Yes.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3726. The Mint-street site must be covered within 12 or 18 months; if part of the buildings were up before the others were pulled down, it would be a relief to those persons turned out?—On the Mint-street site there is a very different class of persons to those who would occupy these buildings; these are chiefly model lodging-houses.

3727. I refer to the persons to be turned out, as indicated upon the plan before the Chairman, would;

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

would not they be accommodated in the Mint-street site, many of them?—Yes.

3728. If the relaxation is given, it would assist them?——

Chairman.

3729. How soon could this be all done if we give you this relaxation?—Having regard to the mass of work which there would necessarily be in the two streets, I should say that it would be done in a year and a half.

3730. Probably in half the time that it would otherwise take?—The South-Eastern Railway Company had a scheme which I had the honour to oppose on behalf of the Board last week, and they propose to make a skew bridge for 390 feet, out of the 830 feet in Mint-street, throwing a high viaduct over it, and putting the ground upon each side into a perfect state of dark shadow and unfittedness, for the purpose to which Parliament has devoted that street.

Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

3731. We could not carry this plan out if they carried out their scheme?—No.

Chairman.

3732. You are opposing that Bill?—We are opposing it.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3733. Are the frontages to this street valuable?—They are not valuable in the same ratio as the others.

3734. What do you consider their value is?—It would make a difference in the letting of about one-third; if you take 2*d.* and 3*d.* as the price for artizans' dwellings, you might get 9*d.* commercially for it.

3735. Then it is not at all a similar case to the other?—No.

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3736. With regard to the Act of 1872. Will you look at Question 1571 in your evidence on the former occasion; you say there, "I may say that now the whole of these sites have been let (the last two were sold out and out), and the buildings are upon seven out of the nine sites;" do you remember that?—Yes.

3737. What has become of the two sites; the one in Frying-pan-alley and Turnmill-street, and the other in Great Eastern-street, have they been covered and let?—As to the site in Frying-pan-alley, and the corner of Turnmill-street, a site has been substituted for that upon the opposite side of the street in Farringdon-road, which is now being covered.

3738. As a matter of fact, the site in Turnmill-street was put into the market for artizans' dwellings purposes, and has remained unsold and unlet; we got a site allowed by the Home Secretary in substitution for it, of the same area, on the opposite side of the street, and that is being covered with artizans' dwellings.

3739. Though the site has not been covered, the substituted site has been covered?—Yes.

3740. How do you deal with plot D in Great Eastern-street?—A plot was accepted in substitution for it

Sir *Sydney Waterlow*—continued.

3741. Is that let and covered?—It is let and covered.

Chairman.

3742. I have got a statement here showing the rateable value of the Metropolis and of the City, the sums charged for artizans' dwellings in annual precept by the Metropolitan Board upon the metropolitan area outside the City, and the amount that the City would have had to contribute towards the Board's expenditure if not excepted by Act of Parliament?—I have not seen that paper before, but I know the facts of it. I see it has the signature of Mr. Gunn, our accountant, and no doubt it is correct.

3743. Will you read it to the Committee?—"Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875: Statement showing the rateable value of the Metropolis and of the City; the sums charged for artizans' dwellings in annual precept by the Metropolitan Board upon the Metropolitan area outside the City, and the amount the City would have had to contribute towards the Board's expenditure if not excepted by Act of Parliament:—

Estimate of	Rateable Value of the Metropolis, including the City.	Rateable Value of the City.	Amount Raised in Precept by the Metropolitan Board for Artizans' Dwellings.	Amount the City would have had to contribute in Metropolitan Board Precept towards Artizans' Dwellings if Charged with its Share.
	£.	£.	£.	£.
1878 -	23,584,728	3,043,567	5,992	775
1879 -	24,065,174	3,106,672	31,581	4,077
1880 -	24,605,926	3,216,701	47,686	6,234
1881 -	27,714,903	3,505,812	53,258	6,737
1882 -	27,520,627	3,500,968	78,528	9,990

That is dated "Spring Gardens, 15th April 1882," and it is signed "*Arthur Gunn*, Accountant."

3744. Altogether, what would the City have had to have contributed?—£. 27,813.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3745. I suppose you have not yet paid by precept for the schemes that you have now got on hand?—We have to make a precept, and the money is paid into the treasury, and it is paid out by the scheme, and we only raise from year to year what the exigency of the year requires.

3745. The total cost to you of schemes now in hand will be much greater than the amount given here?—The total cost is something like 1,700,000*l.*

3747. What out of that would be a fair proportion for the City?—That I cannot say.

3748. Judging by the last proportion for 1882, it would be about 13 per cent.?—Yes.

3749. So that the proportion to the City would be something like 190,000*l.*?—That would be about it.

3750. I understand

Sir *Sydney Waterlow.*

3750. I understand you to say that the cost to the Metropolitan Board of Works of giving effect to the Artizans' Dwellings Act, is calculated at 1,700,000 *l.* for the schemes already in hand?—That is the gross.

Chairman.

3751. That is not the net loss?—No, the net loss is 1,260,000 *l.*; but I am speaking without book.

Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

3752. It would be about 12 per cent. of the net?—Yes; in my evidence before, I said I could not allow anything upon street improvements; the streets were necessary, and whatever widens the streets is a building operation.

Chairman.

3753. We are only discussing the question between the City and the Metropolis?—That is so.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix, No. 1.

Papers handed in by Sir Henry Arthur Hunt, C.B., 6 March 1882: PAGE

List of Awards made by Sir H. A. Hunt under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875 - - - - - - - - - - - - 197

Victoria Dwellings' Association (Limited).—List of Occupations of Tenants:

Battersea Buildings - - - - - - - - - - - - - 198

Stroud Vale Buildings - - - - - - - - - - - - 198

Appendix, No. 2.

Papers handed in by Mr. Frederick William Goddard, 9 March 1882:

Comparative Statement, showing the Original Estimates, together with the Amount of Settlements, made by the Board and the Standing Arbitrators, the Net Result of Jury Appeals, and the Actual Amounts (subject in some instances to Measurement) to be received for Recoupment - - - - - - - - - - - - 199

Comparative Statement of Cost and Estimated Recoupment - - - - - - 200

Re Cost of Public Houses to the Board - - - - - - - - - - - 201

Letter from Lord Derby to Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, dated 26 June 1879 - - 202

Extract from the Whitechapel and Limehouse Conditions of Letting as to approval of Plans, &c., by the Board, and Extract from the Northumberland Avenue Conditions of Letting, showing a similar Clause - - - - - - - - - - - 202

Appendix, No. 3.

Papers handed in by Mr. Grant, 13 March 1882:

Artizans' Schemes.—Comparison of Outlay and Estimated Return - - - - - 204

Memorandum relating to the Artizans' Dwellings Acts - - - - - - - 205

Appendix, No. 4.

Papers handed in by Mr. Frederick William Goddard, 20 March 1882:

Sun-street to Worship-street Improvement.—Particulars of Weekly Tenants, Lodgers, &c., and Place of Rehabitation - - - - - - - - - - - - 208

Metropolitan Board of Works.—Metropolitan Street Improvements Act, 1872:

Sites reserved under Section 49 for the Erection of Labourers' Dwellings.—Comparative Statement and Analysis of all Offers received by the Board for the several Sites, and various Particulars in relation thereto. (Prepared by the Architect, February 1881) - - - - - - - - - - - - - 214

Re-housing Labouring Classes.—Sections inserted in Railway and other Acts - - 216

Appendix, No. 5.

Paper handed in by Mr. Powell, 30 March 1882:

Table showing Names of Societies and Number of Members - - - - - - 219

Appendix, No. 6.

Paper handed in by the Hon. Miss M. Stanley, 3 April 1882:

Statement of the Actual Receipts and Disbursements of Three Houses:—12, Lichfield-street, Soho; 9, Market-street, Newport Market; and 5, Porter-street - - - 220

Appendix, No. 7.

Papers handed in by the Rev. S. Barrett, 3 April 1882: PAGE

List of Occupations of Tenants at George Yard Buildings, July 1881, built by Mr. Crowder - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 222

List of Occupations of Tenants at 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83, Wentworth-street, bought by Lord Pembroke - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 223

List of Occupations of Tenants at Angel-alley, bought by Lord Pembroke - - - 223

Appendix, No. 8.

Paper handed in by Mr. Goddard, April 1882:

Amended Conditions of Sale of Artizans' Plots as finally approved by the Secretary of State - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 224

Appendix, No. 9.

Paper handed in by Mr. Rayner, 24 April 1882;

Borough of Liverpool.—Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvemen Act, 1875.—Conditions of Sale - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 227

Appendix, No. 10.

Paper handed in by Mr. Rayner, 24 April 1882:

Borough of Liverpool.—Nash Grove Improvement Scheme:

List of Objections to the Provisional Award of Sir Henry Arthur Hunt, C.B., heard in the Grand Jury Room, St. George's Hall, Liverpool, on the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd days of June 1877, &c. - - - - - - - - - - - 230

Appendix, No. 11.

Papers handed in by Mr. Shaw Lefevre:

Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875.—Statement showing the Rateable Value of the Metropolis and of the City; the Sums charged for Artizans' Dwellings in Annual Precept by the Metropolitan Board upon the Metropolitan Area outside the City; and the Amount the City would have had to contribute towards the Board's Expenditure if not excepted by Act of Parliament - - - - - - - - - - - 232

Metropolitan Board of Works.—Artizans' Dwellings;

Receipts and Disbursements in each Year from 1875 to 1881 inclusive - - 233

Appendix, No. 12.

Paper handed in by Mr. Shaw Lefevre:

Return showing the Number of Inhabited Houses and the Population in each of the Years 1851, 1861, 1871, and 1881, in the City of London, Metropolitan Police District (excluding City), and London within Limits of Metropolis Local Management Act - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 234

Appendix, No. 13.

Paper, in explanation of Mr. Ashby's Evidence on Questions 132 to 136, and sent to the Chairman by him - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 235

Appendix, No. 14.

Plan handed in by Mr. Goddard, 19 June 1882 - - - - - - - *facing* 236

Appendix, No. 15.

Plan handed in by Mr. Goddard, 19 June 1882 - - - - - - - *facing* 236

Appendix, No. 16.

Memorandum by Mr. Bryce - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 237

APPENDIX.

Appendix, No. 1.

PAPERS handed in by Sir *Henry Arthur Hunt*, C.B., 6 March 1882.

LIST of AWARDS made by Sir *H. A. Hunt* under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875.

NAME OF SCHEME.	Date of Appointment of Arbitrator.	Date of Provisional Award.	Date of Final Award.	Number of Cases Decided.	Number of Cases heard on Appeal.	Number of Days occupied in hearing Appeals against Provisional Award.	Amount of Provisional Award.	Amount of Final Award.	Charge, including all Expenses.
							£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Metropolis—Whitechapel and Limehouse	16 Dec. 1876	28 April 1877	20 Dec. 1877	185	98	12 days	122,622 13 –	130,741 4 –	1,850 – –
Liverpool—Nash-grove	14 Dec. „	3 May „	9 Aug. „	193	35	7 „	40,770 – –	43,628 10 –	950 – –
City of London—Golden-lane and Petticoat-square	10 Nov. 1877	27 Feb. 1878	16 Aug. 1878	395	82	15 „	192,254 – –	213,151 – –	2,625 – –
Norwich—St. Paul's Plain	20 Dec. „	4 May „	24 July „	28	21	2 „	7,302 – –	6,345 – –	262 10 –
Swansea—High-street, Back-street, &c.	11 April 1878	29 Nov. „	10 Feb. 1879	149	75	8 „	60,398 – –	67,775 15 –	1,250 – –
Metropolis—Bedfordbury	11 April „	19 Aug. „	4 Dec. 1878	73	34	5 days, plus two special meetings, *re* "Goupil."	34,043 5 –	37,769 5 –	550 – –
Metropolis—Old Pye-street, Westminster	2 Aug. „	1 Jan. 1879	31 Mar. 1879	32	13	3 days, plus one meeting in "Riche's" case.	22,605 – –	24,675 – –	350 – –
Metropolis—Great Wild-street, Drury-lane	2 Aug. „	7 Jan. „	21 April „	130	76	8 days	71,770 5 –	79,885 5 –	1,200 – –
Metropolis—Pear Tree court, Clerkenwell	2 Dec. „	1 May „	7 July „	75	20	1 day	6,797 – –	6,910 – –	150 – –
Metropolis—High-street, Islington	2 Dec. „	1 May „	26 Aug. „	22	15	3 days	28,576 – –	28,827 – –	420 – –
Metropolis—Whitecross-street, St. Luke's	27 Jan. 1879	6 June „	2 Sept. „	237	122	14 „	229,518 – –	221,635 10 –	2,750 – –
Birmingham	11 July „	22 Mar. 1880	16 June 1880	175	115	12 „	257,578 5 –	270,405 15 –	3,750 – –
Wolverhampton	5 Mar. 1880	24 May „	14 Sept. „	39	28	4 „	59,525 – –	56,165 10 –	840 – –
Walsall	7 June „	23 Aug. „	19 Oct. „	18	3	1 day	7,027 10 –	7,355 15 10	146 – –
Devonport	27 April 1881	3 Aug. 1881	29 Sept. 1881	7	3	1 „	1,519 – –	1,519 – –	130 – –
Metropolis—Little Coram-street, Bloomsbury	20 Dec. „	In hand.		—	—	—	—	—	—
						TOTAL £.	1,142,305 18 –	1,196,789 9 10	

Victoria Dwellings' Association (Limited).

List of Occupations of Tenants.

Battersea Buildings.

Army Scripture Readers	1	Fitters	1
Bakers	1	Foremen	1
Blacksmiths	3	Gilders	1
Bookbinders	1	Grainers	2
Boot and Shoe Makers	3	Horsekeepers	3
Bricklayers	1	Labourers	13
Butchers	1	Masons	4
Cabmen	1	Messengers	1
Carmen	3	Painters	4
Carpenters and Joiners	12	Policemen and Officers	2
Charwomen	4	Plumbers	2
Cheesemongers	1	Porters	10
Clerks	3	Railway Servants	10
Coachmen	6	Servants	2
Coach Builders	1	Tailors and Tailoresses	13
Commissionaires	3	Waiters	2
Compositors and Printers	5	Warehousemen	2
Dressmakers	2	Watchmakers	1
Engineers	3	Miscellaneous	39
Engine Fitters and Workers	3		
Firemen	1	Total	172

Stroud Vale Buildings.

Bakers	2	House Decorators and Plumbers	3
Bill Posters	2	Iron Moulders and Dressers	4
Bookbinders	4	Japan Plate Workers	2
Boot and Shoemakers	7	Labourers	33
Bricklayers	9	Laundresses	6
Brickmakers	2	Manglewomen	2
Brushmakers	3	Masons	3
Butchers	2	Messengers	1
Cabinet Makers	1	Millers	2
Cabmen	26	Needlewomen	4
Carmen	22	Painters	11
Carpenters	19	Pianoforte Makers	4
Charwomen	11	Plasterers	5
Checkers	2	Police Officers	2
Chemists	1	Porters	12
Clerks	4	Railway Servants	31
Coal Porters	16	Sawyers	2
Compositors and Printers	6	Shopfitters	2
Dressmakers	2	Smiths	7
Engine Drivers	3	Stokers	6
Engravers	1	Tailors	3
Firemen	1	Tilemakers	3
Fitters	3	Timekeepers	2
Foremen	5	Waiters	2
Furriers	2	Wood Carvers	2
General Dealers	5	Miscellaneous	65
Grocers	1		
Horsekeepers	6	Total	387

4 March 1882.

Appendix, No. 2.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *Frederick William Goddard*, 9 March 1882.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT, showing the ORIGINAL ESTIMATES, together with the Amount of SETTLEMENTS, made by the BOARD and the STANDING ARBITRATORS, the Net Result of JURY APPEALS, and the Actual Amounts (subject in some instances to Measurement) to be received for Recoupment.

NAME OF SCHEME.	ORIGINAL ESTIMATE.				COMPARATIVE RESULT.				
	Cost of Land.	Cost of Roads and Sewers.	Recoupment.	Net Cost	Amount of Settlement by Board.	Amount of Settlement by Arbitration.	Cost of Land, exclusive of Expenses, &c.	Net Result of Jury Appeals, *see* Note.	Actual Amount received for Recoupment.
	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.
1. Whitechapel and Limehouse - -	100,000	10,500	56,100	54,400	- - nil -	130,741	130,741 and 9,571 *l.* purchased by agreement.	No jury appeals	10,000 for 68,299 feet super., the remainder, 172,730 feet super., in hand.
2. Bedfordbury - - - - -	83,565	2,970	22,540	63,995	36,985	37,769	74,754	- nil -	8,886
3. Goulston-street, and Flower and Deun-street.	267,629	20,000	139,856	147,773	132,022	169,602	301,624	7,101	Not yet sold.
4. St. George-the-Martyr - - -	56,520	3,240	26,407	33,353	26,324	25,171	51,495	850 in favour of claimant.	- ditto.
5. Great Wild-street - - - -	85,035	2,540	38,035	49,540	7,800	79,885	87,685 and 17,450 *l.* purchased by agreement.	- - nil -	15,840
6. Whitecross-street - - - -	251,836	23,400	176,450	98,786	103,464	220,938	324,402	1,350	102,272
7. Old Pye-street - - - -	59,070	5,830	59,070	5,830	36,748	29,405	66,153	125	27,794
8. High-street, Islington - - -	20,865	1,400	14,305	7,960	7,637	28,827	36,464	- - nil -	Not yet sold.
9. Pear Tree-court - - - -	15,410	4,150	14,510	5,050	10,250	6,797	17,047	- - nil -	5,986
10. Essex-road, Islington - - -	110,600	10,000	43,500	77,100	39,973	55,378	95,351	4,380	Not yet sold.
11. Bowman's Buildings - - -	54,200	15,000	15,000	40,700	20,474	22,666	43,140	- - nil -	- ditto.
12. Wells-street, Poplar - - -	These schemes are being dealt with, but the Parliamentary Estimate will probably not be exceeded.								
13. Little Coram-street - - -									
14. Great Peter-street - - - -									

Note.—The result of jury appeals have not been considered in the Estimates, as under the Act the Board have but 10 days in which to give notice of appeal, while claimants can give notice within 10 days from the granting of the certificate, which may be long delayed by questions of title. The Board may yet have to contest many cases with the usual precarious results, and the net gain may be nil.

Comparative Statement of Cost and Estimated Recoupment.

Scheme.	Total Area taken,	Gross Cost per Foot Superficial.	Area of Recoupment.	Estimated Recoupment per Foot Superficial.	Per Centage on Gross Cost.	Remarks.
	Feet.	£. *s.* *d.*	*Feet.*	*s.* *d.*		
Whitechapel and Limehouse - - -	280,000	– 11 6	241,000	2 11 Part sold	25·4	68,299 feet superficial sold to Peabody Trustees.
Bedfordbury - - - - - - -	45,000	1 17 6	33,000	5 – Sold -	13·3	Sold to Peabody Trustees.
Goulston-street - - - - - - -	312,000	1 2 8	190,000 and 52,000 commercial.	8 3 Average -	36·5	190,000 feet superficial at 5 *s.*; 52,000 feet superficial at 20 *s.*
Southwark - - - - - - - -	89,000	– 13 10½	80,000	2 6	17·8	
Great Wild-street - - - - -	68,000	1 14 8	62,000	5 – Sold -	14·4	Sold to Peabody Trustees.
Whitecross-street - - - - -	312,000	1 5 2	155,000 and 48,000 commercial.	8 6 Average -	33·7	155,000 feet sold to Peabody Trustees at 5 *s.*; 48,000 feet superficial estimated at 20 *s.*
Old Pye-street - - - - - -	105,000	– 14 11⅓	62,000 and 27,000 commercial.	5 – Sold -	33·4	Sold to Peabody Trustees.
High-street, Islington - - - - -	49,000	– 17 2⅓	40,000	3 4	19·3	
Pear Tree Court - - - - - -	36,000	– 15 6	24,000	5 – Sold -	32·2	Sold to Peabody Trustees.
Essex-road, Islington - - - - -	213,000	– 10 11	170,000	3 4	30·6	
Bowman's Buildings - - - - -	77,000	– 14 5⅓	59,000 and 3,000 commercial.	3 4	23·	
Wells-street, Poplar - - - - -	150,000	These schemes are being dealt with.		—	—	
Great Peter-street - - - - -	65,000					
Little Coram-street - - - - -	14,000					

Re Cost of Public Houses to the Board.

	St. George the Martyr Scheme.
"Old Justice" Public House, Mint-street, Borough.	This claim included a freehold house and four cottages. The Board's valuation amounted to 5,700 *l.* The provisional award 2,900 *l.*, and the final award, 7,100 *l.*, which represented the value of the freehold and nine years' purchase on the profits put forward by the claimant, or 10 years on the profits estimated by the Board.
	Great Wild Street.
Horton and Marston, "Red Lion" Public House, Princes-street.	This lease had 25 years to run, and the Board had to pay for the lease and six years' profits of the business, in all - - - £. 6.100 Freehold - - 3,000 £. 9,100
	Goulston Street.
"Bull's Head" Public House, 148, High-street, Whitechapel.	This lease had 15 years to run, and the Board had to pay for the lease and five years' profits of the business, in all - - - £. 2.300 Freehold - - 2,000 £. 4,300
The "Princess Alice" Public House, 42, Commercial-street.	This lease had 45 years to run, and the price awarded, 5,000 *l.*, represented in addition to the value of the lease, 6½ years' profits on the trade. Including the freeholder's and occupier's interest, about 6,600 *l.* will be paid for this public-house.
	Whitecross Street.
"Coach and Horses" Public House, Graham-buildings, Whitecross-street.	This lease had about 19 years to run, and the Board had to pay for the lease and 3¼ years' profits of the business, in all - - £. 1,400 Freehold - - 2,800 £. 3,900
"Green Man and Still" Public House.	This lease had 16 years to run, and the Board were advised by the late Mr. Lovejoy to settle at - - - £. 3,000, or five years' purchase on trade. Freehold - - 3,000 £. 6,000
"Black Boy and Still" Public House.	This lease had about 11 years to run, and Mr. Lovejoy advised a settlement at 4½ years' trade profits, the sum awarded included four several cottages, was - - - - - - - £. 3,000 Freehold - - 2,500 £. 5,500
	Bedfordbury.
The "One Tun" Public House, 59, Chandos-street.	This lease had 15 years to run, and the Board had to pay four years' profits, in all - - - - - - - - £. 4.750 Freehold - - 3,300 £. 8,050

LETTER from Lord *Derby* to Sir *James M'Garel-Hogg.*

23, St. James's-square, London,
26 June 1879.

Dear Sir James Hogg,

REFERRING to the offer made to you by Sir Curtis Lampson on behalf of the Peabody Trustees, under date of 26th May last, I think it may be well that I, as chairman of the Trust, should explain the position in which we stand.

The Trustees have up to the present time experienced no difficulty in obtaining such land as they required on moderate terms. The last freehold estate of about 4½ acres, purchased by them from the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, near Victoria Station, was secured at a cost of about 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per foot. They have never until now thought it either necessary or desirable to borrow money for the more rapid prosecution of their work, having still in hand a large unexpired capital, and being unwilling without necessity to incur liabilities or to encumber their estates with a mortgage. Indeed, they were led to make a proposal to the Treasury for a loan, and to apply to your Board for land solely by the fact having come to their knowledge that the arrears cleared, or to be cleared, under the Act of 1875 were likely to remain useless, the conditions on which these areas are disposable being as they understand such as ordinary builders are not willing to comply with. It seemed to them that situations admirably adapted for the dwellings of the working classes could be better turned to account by them than by any private purchaser or by a Company formed on commercial principles.

With this view they decided to extend their operations beyond what was originally contemplated by them, and to incur the responsibility of a heavy debt. Even with the advantages of a loan on easy terms, and of a comparatively cheap purchase, they do not calculate on more than a bare avoidance of loss, and if (as I understand from your communications with Sir Curtis Lampson is not impossible) objection is taken by the Board to the terms offered as being unduly favourable to the purchasers, they will retire without regret from an undertaking on which they have entered solely from considerations of public utility.

They think it right also to state, that in the event of not receiving an early answer to their offer, they will consider it as withdrawn. They do not wish to press you and your colleagues to come to a hasty decision, but they on their part have before them other offers of land, which they will be prepared to entertain if the negotiation with the Board should lead to no result.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *Derby.*

Sir James M'Garel-Hogg,
&c. &c. &c.

EXTRACT from the Whitechapel and Limehouse Conditions of Letting as to approval of Plans, &c. by the Board, and Extract from the Northumberland Avenue Conditions of Letting, showing a similar Clause.

Conditions of Sale.—Whitechapel and Limehouse.

7. The intended lessee shall within six weeks from the date of the contract submit to the said architect, for the time being, of the Board for the approval of the Board, plans, elevations, sections, and drawings, drawn to a scale of one quarter of an inch to a foot, and figured in detail of each of the blocks of buildings to be built by the intended lessee as aforesaid, together with full descriptions or specifications describing in detail the mode of the construction of the buildings, and the internal division of the same, and the fittings and fixtures therein, and the proposed number of holdings and the number of rooms to be provided therein, and the water supply, water-closets, sinks, sewers, drains, dust-shoots, and sanitary arrangements to be made and provided therein, and the materials to be used in the construction of the buildings, and of the fixtures and fittings thereof, and also the intended mode of paving and fencing the said pieces of ground coloured brown on the plan, and the Board may require, and the intended lessee shall submit to any modifications, alterations, omissions, or additions in or to the said plans, elevations, sections, drawings, descriptions, and specification, or any of them as shall to the Board seem fit. A copy of such plans, elevations, sections, drawings, descriptions, and specifications in the form in which the same shall have been approved by the Board shall, when the same have been so approved, be signed by the said architect and by the intended lessee, and be deposited in the office of the said architect, and be binding upon the Board and the intended lessee.

Conditions of Sale.—Northumberland Avenue.

7. The intended lessee shall submit to the superintending architect for the time being of the Board, for the approval of the Board, plans, elevations, sections, and drawings, drawn to a scale of one quarter of an inch to a foot, and figured in detail of the building or buildings to be built by the intended lessee as aforesaid, together with full descriptions or specifications of the construction of the building or buildings, and of the materials to be used, and the Board may require, and the intended lessee shall submit to any modifications, alterations, omissions, or additions, in or to the said plans, elevations, sections, drawings, descriptions, and specifications, or any of them, as shall to the Board seem fit. And a copy of such plans, elevations, sections, drawings, descriptions, and specifications, in the form in which the same shall have been approved by the Board shall, when the same have been so approved be signed by the said architect and by the intended lessee, and be deposited in the office of the said architect, and be binding upon the Board and the intended lessee. The Board may require that the building or buildings as regards the elevation next any public street, thoroughfare or place shall be built according to a general elevation prepared or approved by the Board for a block of buildings to be built on several plots, whether the same are agreed to be let to one lessee or not, and in such case the said architect shall furnish to the intended lessee a copy of the elevation required, and all necessary details.

Appendix, No. 3.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *Grant*, 13 March 1882.

Artizans' Schemes.—Comparison of Outlay and Estimated Return.

The Amounts are taken from Report No. 974.***

1.	2. Total Area taken, including Streets.	3. Estimated Gross Cost, including Legal Expenses, and forming New Streets.	4. Cost per Acre.	5. Total Area to be Sold.	6. Total Sum Estimated to be received for same.	7. Per Acre.	8. Cost of Streets (Estimated), included in 3rd Column.
	Acres.	£.	£.	*Acres.*	£.	£.	£.
White chapel and Limehouse	6·43	161,600	25,000	5·33	33,500	6,300	7,000
Bedfordbury	1·03	84,300	81,800	0·78	8,900	11,400	2,500
Goulston Street, &c.	7·16	353,800	49,400	5·50	98,700	17,900	20,000
St. George-the-Martyr	2·04	61,900	30,300	1·84	9,100	4,900	4,800
Great Wild Street	1·56	118,000	75,600	1·42	15,800	11,100	2,200
Whitecross Street	7·16	392,700	54,800	4·66	102,300	22,000	23,400
Old Pye Street	2·41	78,600	32,600	2·04	27,800	13,600	5,800
High Street, Islington	1·12	42,100	37,600	0·92	7,000	7,600	1,400
Pear Tree Court	0·83	28,000	33,700	0·55	6,000	10,900	5,000
Essex Road	4·89	116,400	23,800	3·90	28,700	7,100	10,000
Bowman's Buildings	1·77	55,700	31,500	1·42	10,300	7,300	2,200
Wells Street, Poplar	3·44	78,400	22,800	2·62	7,800	3,000	8,400
	39·82			30·98			93,200
Total, say	40 acres.	1,571,500		31 acres.	355,900		
		Average	39,300		Average	11,500	
Little Coram Street Great Peter Street	Almost the entire cost of these two schemes will be borne by the Peabody Trustees						1,600
	Total Estimated Cost of forming new and widened Streets to be borne by the Board						94,800

Note.—The amounts in Columns 3 and 6 are taken from the Table at the end of Report 974***. Columns 4, 7, and 8 are given in round figures to the nearest hundred. Column 8 is included in Column 3.

The areas given in Column 2 include the sites of public streets, &c., within the boundaries of the Schemes; those in Column 5 are the net areas exclusive of public streets, and include the land devoted to artizans, and (where such exist) the surplus lands available for commercial purposes, and the price in Columns 6 and 7 is for both descriptions of land, *i.e.*, not that for artizans only.

Artizans Dwellings Acts.

With respect to the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, witness maintains that the principle is unsound which would compel, require, authorise, or even permit a municipal authority at the public expense to purchase house property which had become unfit for occupation by reason of age, decay, neglect, and selfish indifference, to the requirements of health and decency.

To do so would be to reward the owners who, in many cases, have bought for a nominal price worn-out property, only fit for being pulled down, and have got a much higher percentage for their outlay than they could have got for property in good condition.

It would be unjust to owners of better property.

Believes the principle to be unsound that dwellings, any more than food or clothing, should be found for one class of the community at the expense of the rest.

Or that land for sites, any more than materials or labour, should be paid for in whole or in part at public cost.

Not consistent with the constitution or proper functions of a municipal body that it should buy land or houses for the purpose of providing dwellings for any class, still less that such a body should build the houses.

They cannot manage such extensive operations with efficiency and economy, or give the minute attention to details which is required. In the nature of things they cannot be expected to exercise the sharp and constant supervision from morning to night which the stimulus of self-interest compels a man to give whose capital is at stake, and who may be ruined if his vigilance is relaxed.

They cannot buy so cheaply as a private individual. They must employ thoroughly competent men of high standing to act as their agents, and pay them well.

The costs of such agents, witnesses, counsel, juries and arbitrators, all materially add to the expense.

In buying such property the interests of freeholder, leaseholder and tenant, including compensation for disturbance and loss of business, have to be purchased, and the result of the whole is possession of a site purchased at a cost which could only be to any extent recouped if used for first-class manufactories, or commercial business premises.

In such areas there are often warehouses and manufacturing premises, which it is necessary to purchase with the dwelling-houses, to admit of a better arrangement, and afford facilities for access as well as for light and air.

The cost hitherto has been much greater than would be paid for the sites of mansions for the wealthy in some of the best parts of London.

A municipal body going into the market and paying such prices for land, raises the price of land to all others.

A builder erecting houses for working men buys land where it is cheap, and pays but a small fraction of the price which has been paid for the land bought by the Metropolitan Board of Works.

The schemes settled by the Board have a total area, including streets and alleys, of about 42 acres, and seem to have cost on an average about 40,000 *l.* per acre, or for the actual building site, about 50,000 *l.*

Many thousands of workmen's houses have been built on land in the immediate outskirts of London, Balham, New Cross, and Peckham, at from 1,500 *l.* to 2,500 *l.* per acre.

It is impossible that houses can be built on land which has cost 20 times as much, without serious loss to the community.

The highest price obtained by the Board was about a fourth or a fifth of what it cost; in other words they had to sell for from 4 *s.* to 5 *s.* what cost 1 *l.*

The same families, even the same class as those displaced, are not provided for in the new houses. Thus the somewhat better-off class are lodged in houses on which a premium has been paid at the public cost.

Carried to any great extent this would tend to undermine their independence.

If asked, "Would you leave the plague spots of the metropolis untouched, and refuse to give the municipal authority power to deal with them," would answer "No, certainly not."

If a house or a number of houses were found to be, either from a structural or sanitary point of view, dangerous to life or to health, the public authority should have the fullest power to cause such house or houses to be repaired and made fit for safe and healthy occupation, or shut them up, or if necessary take them down, and any administrative expense so incurred should be charged to the owner or owners.

If the property requires periodical supervision, the cost of such supervision should also be charged to the owner.

The municipal body should neither be required nor permitted to purchase the property unless it formed part of a street improvement required for the general public, and authorised by Act of Parliament.

To go further and interfere with the business of building houses, even to the extent of providing sites for them, is unnecessary, as already stated, a waste of public money, and impolitic.

To bind the Metropolitan Board of Works to sell the land which they are obliged to purchase for street improvements only for artizans' dwellings is most wasteful, inasmuch as it would sell for a much higher price for houses of a better class, for shops and business premises. Land equally well adapted for these dwellings is to be got for a small fraction of the value of this land.

The improvements are kept back for years, whilst the slow process proceeds of getting possession of the land, taking down the houses, a few at a time, waiting till the land can be sold under the condition that it is be devoted to one purpose only, and building the new houses.

Public thoroughfares, projected 30 or 40 years ago, like that from Charing Cross to Tottenham Court Road, cannot be carried out.

If buildings fit only for artizans and labourers only were built upon them, the thoroughfare, instead of being an ornament to the locality, would be a permanent eyesore, the population accommodated in the barrack-like structures would be concentrated in one locality, neither to their own nor the public advantage. It would be much better for the people themselves that they should be scattered and spread over a large area.

The class immediately superior to them in means have to go for economy's sake (and for health) into the suburbs.

Increasing numbers of working men are every year doing the same, and find their way on foot, by tramways, railways, and penny steamboats to their work.

There seems to be neither necessity nor advantage in counteracting or resisting this natural and inevitable tendency which exists not only in London, but in all our large towns.

The modification made by the 4th clause of the Artizans Dwellings Amendment Act, 1879, whereby the condition which required the Board to sell the land only for artizans' dwellings, was relaxed so far as to allow of the substitution of other land elsewhere, still maintained a great restraint upon the Board, and has hitherto proved unworkable.

It is still open to the chief objection, which witness began by stating.

In short, there are the gravest objections to subsidising the construction of houses for the poorest class, or those immediately above them.

There is imprudence and recklessness enough in that class without doing anything to foster it.

Large numbers are constantly finding their way to London, tempted by the to them apparently higher wages to be got, but in ignorance of the greater cost of living, and especially of house rent. The feeble and more or less incompetent break down, and increase the vast mass of those who have a difficulty in maintaining their existence.

If, more or less at public expense, a large number of houses were provided below prime cost, the number of premature marriages would largely increase, and with them the embarrassing mass of helpless poverty which already weighs so heavily upon the property and means of the more prudent part of the community.

There can be little doubt that if new houses thus subsidised were in the briefest possible time erected sufficient in number to accommodate half-a-million of persons, it would take but a short time to fill them all. It would greatly stimulate immigration of the same class from the provinces, and the same process would have to be repeated.

The number of houses more or less dilapidated and unfit for occupation is maintained and increased by a variety of causes.

1st. The land on which they are built is generally let on lease, and the houses are unsubstantial, and after a few years show their defects. A poorer class of tenants succeed; larger houses are subdivided, and many serve to house as many families as there are rooms.

Old houses are bought up by men who give a low price for them, vamp them up, and let them to weekly tenants at rents which pay an enormous percentage on the money expended.

The back gardens and yards of houses having originally ample unoccupied space, are built upon, and this process goes on till there is no room for building more.

Large numbers of houses for the poorer classes are built on marshy, wet land, subject from time immemorial to flooding, and divided by stagnant ditches. The foundations are bad, the buildings are in keeping with the site, and every year makes them worse. Because the rents are comparatively low, such houses always find tenants. Instead of

buying

buying up such unwholesome dwellings, the proper course would be to prevent their being built. Municipal authorities should have greater powers for preventing the erection of dwellings on such sites. To buy up such houses, the number of which is constantly being replenished, if not increased, is to undertake that which is impossible, and to pay a most tempting premium for increasing the evil which it is sought to abolish. The 42 acres of houses already undertaken form but a minute fraction of those parts of the metropolis which are equally bad; and so long as the influences which produce such a state of things are suffered to exist unchecked by law and public opinion, it will be found impossible materially to reduce it.

Because the land is cheaper in poor localities, all kinds of offensive trades and depots for storing offensive matter, and articles of produce or import, find refuge in them. For this reason, if for no other, it is most desirable that as large a proportion as possible, should live in suburbs, or less crowded localities.

For these reasons witness disapproves entirely of the policy embodied in the Artizans' Dwellings Acts.

Appendix, No. 4.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *Frederick William Goddard*, 20 March 1882.

SUN STREET TO WORSHIP STREET IMPROVEMENT.

PARTICULARS of WEEKLY TENANTS, LODGERS, &c., and Place of Rehabitation.

Situation of Property.	Names of Tenants.	Avocations.	How long there.	Number of Children.	Rent Paid. Per Week. s. d.	Place of Rehabitation.	P'Week. s. d.
6, Crown-court	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7, Ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19, Christopher-square	Smith, Samuel	Potman	6 years	2	2 6	Corner of Gun-street and Artillery-lane, Bishopsgate.	3 6
19, Ditto - ditto	Calf, Mr.	Labourer	6 „	—	3 —	74, Barlow-street, Walworth	3 3
19, Ditto - ditto	Burles, Edmund	Labourer	8 months	—	3 6	5, Leadenhall-street; daughter's house	—
19, Ditto - ditto	Webster, Frederick	Fruit vendor	18 „	1	2 6	2, Fireball court, Houndsditch	4 6
19, Ditto - ditto	Paterson, Ann	Charwoman	8 years	1	2 6	27, Earl's-street	3 6
19, Ditto - ditto	Tilley, F. H.	Sealing-wax maker; wife takes in mangling.	12 years shop, 9 years parlour.	1	6/- & 3/6	—	—
29, Ditto - ditto	Wood, J.	Bootmaker	9 „	2	3 9	7, Crispin-street, Spitalfields; one room	5 6
29, Ditto - ditto	Barrett, John	French polisher; wife tailoress	2½ „	6	3 —	20, Essex-street, Kingsland-road	7 —
29, Ditto - ditto	Porter, W.	Dock labourer; wife does mangling and washing.	7 „	2	3 6	29, Artillery-lane; two rooms	6 —
29, Ditto - ditto	Procter, Mrs., widow	Needlewoman	15 „	3	2 —	—	—
30, Ditto - ditto	Harvey, J.	Gas-meter tester	2½ „	6	4 —	9, Wood-street, Spitalfields	7 6
33, Ditto - ditto	Graham, A.	City sewers' man	8 „	6	4 6	29, Lell's-road, Stratford	6 —
33, Ditto - ditto	Thornton, Mrs. Mary	—	2 „	—	4 —	11, Coronet-street	3 —
1, Earl-place	Radley, Mrs., widow	Charwoman	1 year	2	3 3	29, Central-street	4 —
1, Ditto	Green, Mrs.	Tailoress (waistcoat maker and machinist).	3 years	—	3 —	2, Paul-street	3 6
1, Ditto	Gibbons, Mrs.	Feather picker	12 „	4	3 9	Brown's-buildings, Clifton-street	3 6
1, Ditto	Stokes, Miss F.	Charwoman	1 year	—	2 3	29, Clifton-street	3 —
2 and 3, Ditto	Howlett, W.	Porter	10 years	—	2 6	10, Brushfield-street	3 —
2 and 3, Ditto	Simmons, J.	Pickler	3 „	—	2 6	36, Great Chart-street	2 6
2 and 3, Ditto	Adams, William	Baker	6 „	—	2 6	—	—
2 and 3, Ditto	Malong, L.	Tailor	1 year	—	2 6	—	—

2 and 3, Ditto	Leonard, G.	Labourer	2 years	–	2 6	49, Grange-road, Hoxton	3 –
2 and 3, Ditto	Wentram, G.	Carman	28 „	–	3 –	22, Barnsbury-road	3 –
3, Ditto	Robertson, W.	Stonemason	18 months	4	4 6	10, Mark-street, Old-street	7 6
3, Ditto	Crane, George	Stove-maker	12 years	1	4 9	2, Ann-street, Bethnal-green	5 –
3, Ditto	Jackson, Mrs.	Charwoman	15 months	2	2 6	9, Acorn-street	2 6
4, King's Head-court	Dewey, E.	Ironer	7 years	–	2 6	27, Almond-street	3 –
4, Ditto - ditto	Hefferman, E.	Laundryman	8 „	–	6 6	2, Gloucester-gardens, Little Collingwood-street, Mile-end; three rooms.	8 –
4, Ditto - ditto	King, Jane	Dressmaker	7 „	–	2 6	2, Huntingdon-street, Kingsland-road	8 –
5, Ditto - ditto	Cooper, George	Printer	7 „	7	6 6	17, Satchwell-street, Bethnal-green; three rooms.	8 6
6, Ditto - ditto	Newson, J.	Cabinet-maker	6 „	4	5 6	20, Rose-street, Shoreditch; house and workshop.	10 6
7, Ditto - ditto	Mackay, J.	Dealer in cast-off wearing apparel.	13 „	3	5 6	Wheeler-street, Bethnal-green	8 –
8, Ditto - ditto	Robertson, H.	General shop; marble mason	20 „	5	5 6	40, Noble-street, Whitechapel; house	12 –
9, Ditto - ditto	Green, George	French polisher	3½ „	2	3 6	2, Coleman-street, St. Luke's	5 –
9, Ditto - ditto	Cuthcart, W.	Bootmaker	–	4	5 –	2, Swan-street, Minories; small house	10 6
10, Ditto - ditto	Macklin, H.	Brieklayer	13 months	1	2 6	—	
11, Ditto - ditto	Winslow, W.	Engineer's assistant	1 year	2	3 6	4, Cumberland-street	5 –
14, Ditto - ditto	Malons, J.	Labourer	1 „	3	4 –	22, Osborne street, Whitechapel; two rooms.	7 –
14, Ditto - ditto	Ryan, J.	Fur dyer, and wife machinist	7 years	2	4 –	21, Henrietta-street, City-road; two rooms.	6 –
15, Ditto - ditto	Bunee, R.	Engineer's labourer; wife machinist.	1 year	3	4 6	34, Peerless-street, City-road; two rooms.	6 –
31, Ditto - ditto	Bennett, S.	Plumber	About 18 years	–	5 –	27, Earl's-street	5 –
31, Ditto - ditto	Ginn, T. E.	Mattress maker	8 years	2	3 –	29, Ashford-street, Hoxton; two rooms	6 6
31, Ditto - ditto	Scott, J.	Porter	5 „	–	2 6	Crystal "Palace" public-house, 95, East-street.	–
31, Earl-street	Grant, M.	Warehouse porter	1 year	–	2 6	30, Cecil-street	3 6
31, Ditto	Goodyear, S.	Nurse	1 „	–	2 –	15, Prince's-street, Clifton-street	3 –
31, Ditto	Rowbottom	Labourer in ironworks	Say 7 years	–	4 3	65, Bow-street, Landport	–
31, Ditto	Fossitt, H.	Tailor and machinist	2 years	–	4 6	26, Praed-street	5 6
31, Ditto	Sillie, Hy.	Railway porter	19 months	–	3 –	3, Clifton-street	3 6
31, Ditto	East, C.	Master tailor and machinist	8 years	3	7 –	95, Clifton-street; eight rooms	38*l.* p'yr.
31, Ditto	Liddell	Litho printer; wife machinist	10 „	6	7 –	3, Prince's-square, Wilson-street; two rooms.	6 –
31, Ditto	Lewis, Mrs.	Laundress	6 „		3 –	13, South-street	3 6
31, Ditto	Hymas, Miss	Office cleaner	4 „	–	3 –	14, North-buildings	4 –
31, Ditto	Norris, F.	Farrier	14 „	5	4 6	28, Spital-square; two rooms	9 –
2, Bartlett's-place	Wimble, T.	Fish-dealer	8 years	1	4 –	Club-row, next door to oilshop	4 –

SUN STREET TO WORSHIP STREET IMPROVEMENT—*continued.*

Situation of Property.	Names of Tenants.	Avocations.	How long there.	Number of Children.	Rent Paid. Per Week. s. d.	Place of Rehabitation.	P' Week. s. d.
1, Bartlett's-place	Thompson, T. C.	Steam turner	4 years	–	10 –	10, Red Lion-street, New Inn Yard.	
2 and 3, Ditto	Thornton, J.	Wholesale pickler	12 „	4	5 6	2, Ann-street, Bethnal-green; house	14 –
3, Ditto	Noble, C.	Pickler	6 „	–	2 9	13, Paul-street	3 –
3, Ditto	Griffiths, C.	Charwoman	8 „	–	2 9	6, Mount-street, Bethnal-green	4 –
4, Ditto	Dronksfield, R.	Fish dealer	6 „	–	2 9	—	–
4, Ditto	Mills, Charles	Bird dealer	3 „	–	2 9	2, Club-row	4 –
4, Ditto	Trevit, R.	Painter	5 „	–	2 9	Old-street; friend, Mr. Fry	–
5, Ditto	Owen, J.	Bottle dealer	4 „	3	5 6	6, Boundary-street	6 –
5, Ditto	Sport, James	Bottle dealer	1 year	5	2 9	7, Ware-street, Hoxton	
1, Ruddock's-buildings	Jordan, J.	Porter	2 years	5	5 6	21, Steward-street, Spitalfields; one room.	6 –
1, Ditto - ditto	Forman, Mrs., widow		3½ „	4	5 –	—	–
2, Ditto - ditto	Brooks, J.	Sweep	2 „	–	5 6	2, Pearl-street, Commercial-street; one room.	4 –
2, Ditto - ditto	Smith, John	Painter	4 „	6	4 6	4, Widegate-alley, Bishopsgate	3 –
2, Ditto - ditto	Clarke, W.	Horsekeeper	3 „	4	5 –	50, Calford-road, Kingsland	7 6
2, Ditto - ditto	Westworth, H.	Skin dresser	2 „	3	5 6	175, Waterlow-buildings, Bethnal-green	–
3, Ditto - ditto	Rose, Mrs. M. A., widow	Tailoress	11 „	–	3 3	"Prince of Wales," beerhouse, Finsbury Market.	4 –
4, Ditto - ditto	King, James	Gasfitter	26 „	7	5 6	—	–
5, Ditto - ditto	Hobben, Eliza	Boxmaker	6 „	–	3 –	78, Canonbury-road; friend	–
5, Ditto - ditto	Wakefield, E., widow	Charwoman	6 „	2	3 6	8, Artillery-lane	5 –
6, Ditto - ditto	Cooper, Miss M. A.	Fur sewer	4 „	–	3 6	Old Ford	4 –
6, Ditto - ditto	Doddemede, T.	Shopman	32 „	–	2 6	5, Wood-street, Spitalfields; 3 rooms	8 –
6, Ditto - ditto	Thurgood, J.	Carpenter	6 „	4	4 6	Near Bow Station	4 –
7, Ditto - ditto	Crawley, William	Lithographic printer	1 „	3	3 –	8, Cambridge Heath-road	5 –
7, Ditto - ditto	Boyce, Mrs., widow	Dealer	4 months	4	3 6	15, Banner-street, Whitecross-street	3 6
7, Ditto - ditto	Hopkins, J.	Packer	4 years	4	4 –	3, Rose-court, Widegate street, Bishopsgate; 3 rooms.	6 –
7, Ditto - ditto	Butler, S.	Bricklayer	6 „	2	3 9	8, Windsor-street, Bishopsgate street; 2 rooms.	8 –
7, Ditto - ditto	Jackson, H.	Hawker	1 year	1	3 –	7, Bateman-row; one room	3 9
8, Ditto - ditto	Smith, J.	Warehouseman	8 years	2	5 –	24, Radcliffe-grove, Lever-street	5 –
8, Ditto - ditto	Fenley, H.	Railway porter	18 months	2	3 6	12, Scrutton-street; one room	4 –
9, Ditto - ditto	Barriff, T.	Collar paster	5 years	2	4 6	41, Waterloo-street, St. Luke's; one room	5 –
11, Ditto - ditto	Baston, W.	Shoemaker	2 „	–	12 –	Cornwall	–

11, Ditto - ditto - - -	Mitton, B. - - - -	Shoemaker - - - -	2 „ - -	5	4	6	17, Gun-street, Spitalfields; two rooms -	8	–
12, Ditto - ditto - - -	Peneycoyd, W. - - -	Horsehair weaver - - -	5 „ - -	–	4	6	37, Spicer-street, Brick-lane; one room	5	–
12, Ditto - ditto - - -	Falkener, F. - - - -	Cabinet maker - - -	12 „ - -	5	5	–	4, Sebright-street, Hackney road; three rooms.	7	–
13, Ditto - ditto - - -	Reynolds, S. - - - -	Laundress - - - -	6 „ - -	2	5	–	4, Sweet Apple-court, Bishopsgate -	6	–
14, Ditto - ditto - - -	Hudson, S. - - - -	Furniture porter; wife ironer -	8 „ - -	5	11	–	52, Granville-buildings; 8, Luke-street	8	–
14, Ditto - ditto - - -	Brown, J. - - - -	Cabinet maker - - -	3 „ - -	6	4	6	Sandy-street; two rooms - - -	7	–
	Edwards, J. - - - -	Porter - - - - -	2 „ - -	–	4	–	14, King-street, Mile End - - -	6	6
15*a*. Ditto - ditto - - -	Pack, T. - - - -	Bootmaker - - - -	4 „ - -	3	4	6	40, Buxton-street, Spitalfields - -	4	6
15, Ditto - ditto - - -	Ware, Mrs. - - - -	Dressmaker - - - -	7 „ - -	–	3	6	48, Granville-buildings, Luke-street, E.C.; three rooms.	8	–
15, Ditto - ditto - - -	Hatton, Mrs. M. - - -	- - - - - - -	7 „ - -	–	2	6	4, Pitman's Yard, Kingsland-road.	–	
1, Brett's-buildings - - -	Braham, R. - - - -	Cabinet maker - - -	5 „ - -	–	3	–	—	–	
2, Ditto - - - -	Wright, S. - - - -	Milk dealer - - - -	8 „ - -	2	10	–	24, Hollywell-row; house - - -	24 *l.* per annum.	
3, Ditto - - - -	Sullivan, P. - - - -	Tailor - - - - -	7 „ - -	5	11	–	19, Milton-street, Barbican; two rooms	9	–
4, Ditto - - - -	Smith, J. G. - - -	Newspaper and tobacconist -	18 „ - -	2	6	–	—	–	
8, East-street - - - -	Reynolds - - - -	Undertaker &c. - - -	12 „ - -	–	12	–	1, Evans-court, Basinghall-street; two rooms.	7	–
8, Ditto - - - -	Lee, P. - - - -	Labourer; wife laundress -	12 „ - -	8	6	–	—	–	
8, Ditto - - - -	Foster, Mrs., widow - -	Waistcoat maker - - -	2 „ - -	2	3	–	8, Windmill-street; one room - -	5	6
8, Ditto - - - -	Edmonds, W. T. - - -	Porter - - - - -	10 months -	2	4	6	8, Windmill-street; one room - -	5	–
8, Ditto - - - -	Cole, Mrs. - - - -	Chair-caner - - - -	9 years - -	–	2	6	8, St. James-place, Scrutton-street - -	2	–
72, Long-alley - - - -	Steel, William - - -	Saddler - -	8 months -	–	3	–	7, Earl-street. - - - - - -	–	
72, Ditto - - - -	Prestnall, Mrs. A., widow -	Nurse - - - - -	16 years - -	–	2	–	27, Newton-street, New North-road -	3	6
72, Ditto - - - -	Davis, T. - - - -	Capmaker - - - -	5 „ - -	–	2	6	York street - - - - - - -	3	6
73, Ditto - - - -	Horton, W. - - - -	Scavenger - - - -	3 „ - -	3	3	–	2, Turnbull-street, Shoreditch - -	4	6
74*a*, Ditto - - - -	Profit, T. - - - -	Horse collar maker - -	3 „ - -	2	5	–	62, Wilson-street - - - - -	4	4
74, Ditto - - - -	Kenedy, J. - - - -	Cane cutter and broom maker -	2 „ - -	–	2	9	26, Edward-street, Bethnal-green - -	3	–
74, Ditto - - - -	Hide, George - - -	Cabinet maker - - -	3½ „ - -	–	–		—		
76, Ditto - - - -	Joel, Moss - - - -	Capmaker and trimming dealer	8 „ - -	6	8	–	12, Scarborough-street, Whitechapel; house.	16	–
73, Long-alley, and 1, Smith-buildings.	Lowman, W. - - -	Brushmaker - - - -	26 „ -	1	8	–	—	–	
2, Smith's-buildings - - -	Dale, Thomas - - -	Labourer; wife laundress -	13 „ - -	1	5	–	8, Edith-road, Stratford; house - -	11	–
3, Ditto - ditto - - -	Offord, R. - - - -	Carman - - - -	4 „ - -	2	5	–	Stratford - - - - - - -	9	–
4, Ditto - ditto - - -	Padain, E. - - - -	Potman - - - -	- - -	–	5	–	2, Gloucester gardens, Little Collingwood-street; two rooms.	5	–
5, Ditto - ditto - - -	Thompson, H. - - -	Saddler; wife bookfolder -	8 „ - -	1	5	–	30, Granville-buildings; three rooms -	7	6
6, Ditto - ditto - - -	Allwood, E. - - - -	Baker; wife dressmaker -	7 „ - -	1	5	–	48, Leonard-street; two rooms - -	7	6
7, Ditto - ditto - - -	Turnow, S. - - - -	Bootmaker; wife laundress -	22 „ - -	4	5	6	—	–	
8, Ditto - ditto - - -	Carrow, S. - - - -	Tailor; wife tailoress - -	3 „ - -	–	5	6	6, Brawne's-buildings, 11, Beech-street, Barbican; five rooms.	16	–

SUN STREET TO WORSHIP STREET IMPROVEMENT—*continued.*

Situation of Property.	Names of Tenants.	Avocations.	How long there.	Number of Children.	Rent Paid.	Place of Rehabitation.	P' Week.
					Per Week. s. d.		s. d.
9, Smith's-buildings	Cole, W.	Warehouseman	4 years	1	5 –	73, Masboro'-road, Hammersmith, north	–
10, Ditto - ditto	Grey, Mrs. E.	Dressmaker	23 „	1	5 –	36, Great Chart-street, East-road; two rooms.	7 6
11, Ditto - ditto	Major, G.	Cabman	2½ „	1	5 6	114, Gladstone-buildings, Willow-street	7 –
12, Ditto - ditto	Sellwood, R.	Lithographic printer	10 „	6	5 –	8, Granville-buildings, Luke-street; three rooms.	8 –
17, Ditto - ditto	Bonning, G.	Boxmaker	24 „	–	5 –	2, Tabernacle-row	3 –
18, Ditto - ditto	Thompson, R.	Shoemaker	5 „	4	5 –	91, Sun-street; two rooms	8 –
19, Ditto - ditto	Keymer, J.	Horsesmith	20 „	5	5 –	16, Queen-street, Worship-street; two rooms.	8 –
20, Ditto - ditto	Weldon, W.	Boot and shoe machinist	4 „	–	5 6	25, Leman-street; two rooms	8 6
23, Ditto - ditto	Tillyard, F.	Looking glass frame maker	30 „	3	5 –	8, Market-street; two rooms	7 –
24, Ditto - ditto	Pack, W.	Bootmaker; wife machinist	11 „	3	5 –	8, Queen-street, Finsbury; two rooms	7 –
25, Ditto - ditto	Dear, J.	Porter	40 „	1	5 –	19, Clifford street; two rooms	7 –
26, Ditto - ditto	Bonning, J.	Umbrella maker	4 „	1	5 –	21, Fore-street, Spitalfields; one room	6 –
27, Ditto - ditto	Seabrook, S.	Labourer	5 „	5	5 –	3, Garden-row, St. Luke's	4 6
22, Ditto - ditto	Gaylor, J.	Table maker	6 „	11	8 –	7, Worship-street; three rooms	12 6
1, Meetinghouse-court	Seeley	Bricklayer's labourer	7 „	–	5 –	12, Clifton-place, Shoreditch; two rooms	5 –
2, Ditto - ditto	Webster, J.	Labourer and shopkeeper	15 „	5	4 6	16, Pead-street, Commercial-road; two rooms.	7 –
2, Ditto - ditto	Onion, Anne	Hawker	15 „	–	2 –	4, New Inn, Broadway	3 –
3, Ditto - ditto	Rowe	Shoemaker	4 „	–	5 –	8, Market-street; two rooms	5 6
4, Ditto - ditto	Holloway, J.	Invalid wife deals in left off clothes.	9 „	2	4 9	Church-street	4 –
5, Ditto - ditto	Hunt, T.	Rustic flower standmaker	18 „	4	4 6	3, Phipp's-street; two rooms	6 6
6, Ditto - ditto	Hunt, J.	General dealer	16 „	3	5 –	Friar's-mount, Bethnal-green; tenement-	10 –
7, Ditto - ditto	Newson, J.	Cabinetmaker	9 „	4	5 –	—	–
8, Ditto - ditto	Hickson, Hy.	Silk dyer; wife machinist	11 „	4	4 9	84, Granville-buildings; three rooms	8 –
9, Ditto - ditto	Newson, Thomas	Chairmaker	26 „	–	4 6	25, Paradise-street, Paul street, Finsbury; four-roomed house.	10 –
10, Ditto - ditto	Smith, J.	French polisher	9 „	–	4 9	28, Charlotte-street	9 –

11, Ditto - ditto - - -	Orger, S. - - - - -	Dressmaker - - - -	30 „ - -	2	3 9	3, Poole's-square, Quaker-street, Spital-fields; one room.	4 6	
12, Ditto - ditto - - -	Richardson, Mary Ann - -	Mangling, and laundress -	10 „ - -	4	4 9	Facing "Eagle" public-house, Stratford; six-roomed house.	11 –	
1, Devonshire-buildings - -	Skale, Mrs., widow - -	- - - -	33 „ - -	3	10 –	135, Clifton-street; house - - -	50 *l.*	
1, Ditto - ditto - - -	Brackin, J. - - - -	Bedstep maker - - -	6 „ - -	4	6 –	2, Scrutton-street; two rooms - -	6 6	
1, Ditto - ditto - - -	Sadler, Eliz. - - - -	Medical lace maker - -	4 „ - -	–	2 –	16, Curtain-road; one room - -	3 –	
1*a*, Ditto - ditto - - -	Stedman, A. - - - -	Writer - - - - -	4 „ - -	6	7 –	4, Prince's-square; three rooms - -	6 –	
2, Ditto - ditto - - -	Willis, W. - - - -	Coal heaver - - - -	1 „ - -	3	3 9	10, Butlers'-buildings, George-street, Spitalfields; two rooms.	7 –	
2, Ditto - ditto - - -	Almond, W. - - - -	French polisher - - -	9 months -	–	4 6	Scrutton-street - - - - - -	3 3	
2, Ditto - ditto - - -	Willis, W., jun. - - -	Coal heaver - - - -	1 year - -	3	2 9	5, Butler's-buildings, George-street; two rooms.	6 –	
2, Ditto - ditto - - -	Flowers, S. - - - -	Farrier - - - - -	2 years - -	–	3 9	15, Paul-street - - - - -	4 6	
2, Ditto - ditto - - -	Hibbert, H. - - - -	Labourer - - - -	2 „ - -	–	2 9	12, Mile-street, East-road - - -	4 6	
3, Ditto - ditto - - -	Taylor, J. - - - -	Washing and charing - -	7½ „ - -	7	3 9	11, Bishopsgate-street - - - -	5 6	
3, Ditto - ditto - - -	Sullivan, Mr. - - -	Tailor; wife tailoress at home	6½ „ - -	3	4 6	Scrutton-street; two rooms - - -	7 –	
3, Ditto - ditto - - -	Johnson, F. - - - -	Pewterer - - - -	3½ „ - -	1	2 9	1, Finsbury Market; one room - -	3 –	
3, Ditto - ditto - - -	Antwiss, J. - - - -	Night watchman - - -	5½ „ - -	1	3 9	2, Chapel-street; one room - - -	4 6	
5, Ditto - ditto - - -	Smith, Miss M. - - -	Laundress - - - -	2 „ - -	–	2 –	5, Booth-street, Pitfield-street - -	2 6	
5, Ditto - ditto - - -	Bose, Mrs. - - - -	Tailoress and machinist - -	7 „ - -	1	9 –	9, Upper John-street, Golden-square; one room.	5 –	
6, Ditto - ditto - - -	Griffiths, B. - - - -	Cabinet maker - - -	24 „ - -	4	10 –	61, Old Nichol-street, Bethnal-green; four rooms.	12 –	
8, Ditto - ditto - - -	Baber, J. - - - -	Night watchman - - -	3 „ - -	2	4 9	Gone, left 16th September; owes eight weeks' rent.	–	
9, Ditto - ditto - - -	Samuels, A., widow - -	Washerwoman - - -	13 „ - -	10	4 9	17, Reform-place, Goldsmith row - -	7 –	
1, Devonshire-court - - -	Smith, J. - - - -	Fancy cabinet maker - -	11 „ - -	–	3 6	6, Sandy-street, Artillery-lane - -	5 –	
2, Ditto - - - -	Marlborough, E. - - -	Fur skin dyer - - -	7 „ - -	5	3 6	24, Granville-buildings; three rooms -	8 –	
96, Worship-street - - -	Bartlett, William - - -	Confectioner - - -	9 „ - -	2	One guinea.	—	–	
96, Ditto - - - -	Gorman, Mrs. - - -	Office cleaner - - -	2½ „ - -	4	3 6	1, Sweet Apple-court - - - -	4 –	
96, Ditto - - - -	Barness, R. - - - -	- - - -	2 „ - -	–	5 –	—	–	
96, Ditto - - - -	Ford, Ellen - - - -	- - - -	1 year - -	–	3 6	26, Gun street, E. - - - -	5 –	
98, Ditto - - - -	Burns, Alice, widow - -	General shop - - -	18 years - -	–	14 8	—	–	
98, Ditto - - - -	Smith, Mrs. H. - - -	Charwoman - - - -	5 „ - -	2	5 6	Artillery-lane; two rooms - - -	7 –	
98, Ditto - - - -	Horan, W. - - - -	Labourer - - - -	7 „ - -	1	6 –	65, Houndsditch; two rooms - -	6 –	
100, Ditto - - - -	Crossley, Thomas - - -	Coach painter - - -	17 „ - -	1	5 6	59, Worship-street; two rooms - -	9 –	
	Fenwick, T. - - - -	Porter - - - - -	10 months -	–	5 –	—	–	

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS. - - - - - - - -

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS ACT, 1872. - - - - - - - - -

SITES reserved under SECTION 49 for the Erection of LABOURERS' DWELLINGS. - - - - - -

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT and ANALYSIS of all OFFERS Received by the BOARD for the

PLOT.	Date of Clearance of Ground.	New Street Completed.	First Advertised.	ARCHITECT'S VALUATION.			IMPROVED INDUSTRIAL DWELLINGS COMPANY.									
							Sept. 1876.		April 1877.		May 1878.		Jan. 1879.		Mar. 1879.	
				Area in square feet.	Per ft.	Rental per annum.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft
					d.	£.	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*
*A.—CLERKENWELL-ROAD - - -	Dec. 1876	July 1878	Feb. 1879	21,600	4	360	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	252	2·8
B.—CLERKENWELL-ROAD - - -	Dec. 1877	July 1878	April 1878	10,650	4	177	–	–	–	–	60	1·35	54	1·22	–	–
*C.—TURNMILL-STREET, CLERKENWELL	Mar. 1877	July 1878	April 1877	17,500	4	291	–	–	150	2·06	150	2·06	135	1·85	–	–
*D.—GREAT EASTERN-STREET - -	July 1875	Oct. 1876	Aug. 1876	12,000	4	200	120	2·4	96	1·92	100	2	90	1·8	–	–
*E.—GREAT EASTERN-STREET - -	Vacant at Date of Act, 1872.	Oct. 1876	Aug. 1876	5,040	5	105	55	2·62	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*F.—GREAT EASTERN-STREET - -	Ditto -	Oct. 1876	Aug. 1876	12,600	6	315	155	2·95	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
*G.—GREAT EASTERN-STREET - -	Jan. 1877	Oct. 1876	April 1877	18,500	3	231	–	–	100	1·3	96	1·25	86	1·12	–	–
H.—BETHNAL GREEN-ROAD - -	Dec. 1877	March 1879	April 1878	12,500	3½	182	–	–	–	–	110	2·11	–	–	–	–
I.—SHACKLEWELL-STREET, BETHNAL GREEN.	Nov. 1878	March 1879	April 1878	18,000	2½	187	–	–	–	–	80	1·07	–	–	–	–

* These plots, as offered to the public, are modifications of the sites originally reserved under the Act, the Board having, with the approval of the Home Secretary, voluntarily given up part of their valuable surplus lands, available for commercial purposes, in order to render the sites capable of being more advantageously utilised for the erection of dwellings for the labouring classes. The sites were placed in the market as soon as it was practicable to do so; and any apparent delay is attributable to the time occupied in making these arrangements, and in disposing of other preliminary difficulties. As regards Plot A., the original site was scheduled for Metropolitan Street Improvements Bill of 1877, and would have been pierced by the proj new street from Gray's Inn-road towards the "Angel," Islington, powers to construct w were, however, not granted by Parliament. The substituted site has been so arranged tha remainder of the land can be usefully dealt with, whether the new street is eventually carried or not.

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS ACT, 1872.

SITES reserved under SECTION 49 for the Erection of LABOURERS' DWELLINGS.

veral SITES, and various Particulars in relation thereto. (*Prepared by the Architect, February* 1881.)

NATIONAL DWELLINGS SOCIETY.		HOOK AND OLDREY.				HENDREY.		ALLEN.		EUXLEY.		TOYE.		FOSKETT.		PRESENT CONDITION OF SITES.
tember 1876.		May 1878.		March 1879.		May 1878.		May 1878.		March 1879.		May 1880.		December 1880.		
ntal.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	Rental.	Per ft.	
£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	£.	*d.*	
–	–	–	–	300	3·3	–	–	–	–	–	–	300 Accepted.	3·3	–	–	This site was let to Mr. S. Toye, under agreement, dated 11th October 1880, by which it is provided that buildings shall be completed fit for occupation within two years. Plans for covering the whole of the ground with model dwellings were approved, 1st November 1880, and building operations are now in active progress. The buildings are to be seven storeys in height, and will contain 94 tenements of two rooms each, and 65 tenements of three rooms each. Each tenement is supplied with w.c., scullery, and other conveniences.
–	–	170 Withdrawn.	3·83	–	–	155 Abandoned.	3½	–	–	–	–	–	–	120 Accepted.	2·7	Let to Mr. G. Foskett, under agreement, dated 9th February 1881. The buildings are to be completed fit for occupation by 9th February 1882. Mr. Foskett has the option of acquiring the freehold after the erection of the buildings, but within two years of the date of the agreement, for the sum of 2,400 *l.*, being 20 years' purchase of the ground rent.
–	–	–	–	–	–	255 Abandoned.	3½	–	–	291 Abandoned.	4	–	–	–	–	Still vacant. The site is clearly defined by an enclosing fence, and a large notice board is fixed upon the ground announcing the object for which it is to be let or sold.
–	–	–	–	–	–	175 Abandoned.	3½	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	The Home Secretary has consented to release the Board from their obligation as to the front portion of this plot, comprising a superficial area of about 2,400 feet, in consideration of their devoting a similar area of ground in Appold-street, Shoreditch, to the erection of labourers' dwellings. The substituted site is agreed to be let at 50 *l.* per annum, or 5 *d.* per foot, but the remainder of Plot D. is still unlet.
05 Accepted.	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	A handsome block of buildings has been erected by the National Dwellings Society, containing 132 rooms, or 48 tenements, which are at present inhabited by 236 persons.
15 Accepted.	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	Two blocks of buildings, named Derby Houses and Chichester Houses, have been erected by the National Dwellings Society. They are divided into 72 tenements, comprising 220 rooms, which are now occupied by 213 persons.
–	–	–	–	–	–	270 Abandoned.	3½	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	This plot is still vacant and unlet.
–	–	165	3·17	–	–	182	3½	260 Accepted.	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	This site was let immediately upon being placed in the market. A substantial block of dwellings, styled Huntingdon Buildings, has been erected by Mr. Allen. The tenements, of which there are 60, comprising 240 rooms, were inhabited early in 1880.
–	–	245 Withdrawn.	3·37	–	–	262 Abandoned.	3½	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	This plot is still unlet.

).

RE-HOUSING LABOURING CLASSES.

SECTIONS inserted in Railway and other Acts.

The terms of the 33rd section are exceedingly stringent, and almost prohibitory, and we have failed to find a precedent for it, but the following extracts from Railway and other Acts relating to the re-housing of the labouring classes will prove that where provisions have been inserted respecting the labouring classes, sections regulating the notices to be given, and the accommodation to be provided for them, have been very different in terms, and far less stringent than those imposed upon the Board.

Metropolitan Board of Works (Various Powers) Act, 1876.—*Sun Street Improvement.*

The following sections were inserted in the above Act :—

Notice to be given of taking houses of labouring classes.

28. The company shall not, less than eight weeks before they take in any parish, 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partly by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, make known their intention to take the same by placards, handbills, or other general notice placed in public view, upon or within a reasonable distance from such houses, and the company shall not take any such houses until they have obtained the certificate of a justice that it has been proved to his satisfaction that they have so made known their intention.

Board to procure accommodation for persons of the labouring class to be displaced.

29. Before the Board shall take, under the powers of this Act, 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, the Board shall procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person or persons ; provided always, that if any question shall arise as to the sufficiency of such accommodation, the same shall be determined by a justice.

The following is Lord Redesdale's Model Clause, and is inserted in all Acts where labouring classes are displaced :—

Extract from Model Bill.

Notice to be given of taking houses of labouring classes.

7. Notice to be given when 15 or more houses of labouring classes are taken.

The company shall, not less than eight weeks before they take in any parish 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, make known their intention to take the same by placards, handbills, or other general notice placed in public view, upon or within a reasonable distance from such houses, and the company shall not take any such houses until they have obtained the certificate of a justice [the sheriff] that it has been proved to his satisfaction that they have so made known their intention.

Accommodation to be Provided before taking 15 Houses.

A clause, following almost word for word the undermentioned clauses, and similar in effect, is found in the following Railway Acts:—

Company to procure accommodation for persons of the labouring classes to be displaced.

26. Before taking in any parish 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, who may for the time being be the occupier or occupiers of any house or part of any house which the company are by this Act authorised to acquire, the company shall (unless the company and such person or persons otherwise agree) procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person or persons ; provided always, that if any question shall arise as to the sufficiency of such accommodation, the same shall be determined by a justice, and the company may, for the purpose of procuring such accommodation, appropriate any lands for the time being belonging to them, or which they have power to acquire, and may purchase by agreement such further lands as may be necessary for such purpose, and may, on such lands, erect labouring-class dwellings, and may apply for the purposes of this section, or any of them, any moneys they may have already raised, or are authorised to raise.

The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Act, 1876 -	Section 26.
The London and Blackwall Railway Act, 1876 - -	Section 18.
The Great Northern Railway Act, 1877 - - -	Section 24.
The London and Blackwall Railway Act, 1877 - -	Section 32.
The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1878 - -	Section 15.
The London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Act, 1879,	Section 15.

Accommodation to be Provided for any Persons of the Labouring Classes to be Displaced.

A clause following almost word for word the undermentioned clause, and similar in effect, is found in the following Railway Acts :—

Accommodation to be procured for persons of the labouring classes displaced.

41. Before displacing any person belonging to the labouring classes, who may for the time being be the occupier of any house or part of any house which the said companies or company, as the case may be, are by this Act authorised to acquire for the purpose of the

the railway, the said companies or company, as the case may be, shall (unless they and such other person otherwise agree) procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person. Provided always that if any question shall arise as to the sufficiency of such accommodation, the same shall be determined by a justice, and the said companies or company, as the case may be, may, for the purpose of providing such accommodation, appropriate any lands for the time being belonging to them, or which they have power to acquire, and for that purpose may purchase lands by agreement, and may on any such lands erect labouring-class dwellings, and may let or otherwise dispose of such lands and premises, and may apply for the purposes of this section or any of them, any monies they may have already raised or are authorised to raise, and which moneys, if made payable to any special purpose, are not required for that purpose.

The last three lines are not found in all cases.

The Great Western Railway Act, 1876 - - -	Section 41.
The East London Railway Act, 1876 - - -	Section 22.
The Great Western Railway Act, 1877 - - -	Section 25.
The London and North Western Railway Act, 1877,	Section 19.
The Metropolitan Railway Act, 1877 - - -	Section 14.
The Great Western Railway Act, 1878 - - -	Section 23.
The East London Railway Act, 1879 - - -	Section 8.
The Great Eastern Railway Act, 1879 - - -	Section 19.
The Metropolitan and District Railway (City Lines and Extensions) Act, 1879 - - - - -	Section 46.

Midland Railway.

The two following Sections appear in the Midland Railway Acts of 1876 and 1878.

Notice to be given of taking houses of labouring classes.

31. The company shall not, less than eight weeks before they take in any parish 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, make known their intention to take the same by placards, handbills, or other general notice placed in public view upon or within a reasonable distance from such houses, and the company shall not take any such houses until they have obtained the certificate of a justice that it has been proved to his satisfaction that they have so made known their intention.

Provision as to accommodation for persons belonging to labouring classes.

32. And whereas the construction of the works and the acquisition and appropriation by the company of lands, houses, and buildings, as by this Act authorised, will involve a removal of some houses of the class referred to in the immediately preceding section, and it is expedient that provision should be made for the accommodation of such of the before-mentioned persons as may be displaced by such removal; therefore, before displacing any such person as aforesaid, the company shall provide sufficient accommodation elsewhere, unless the company and such person otherwise agree. Provided always, that if any difference shall arise as to the sufficiency of the accommodation proposed to be provided by the company, the same shall be determined by a justice, and the company may, for the purpose of providing such accommodation, appropriate any lands for the time being belonging to them, or which they have power to acquire, and may purchase lands by agreement, and may on any such lands erect labouring-class dwellings, and may let or otherwise dispose of such lands.

The following Section from the *South Western Railway Act*, 1877, is somewhat peculiar.

Power for company to appropriate lands for the erection of dwelling-houses for the labouring classes.

23. The company may from time to time, if and when they think fit, appropriate any lands acquired by them under the powers of this Act, and which may not be required for the railway and works for the purpose of the erection of dwelling-houses or buildings for persons belonging to the labouring classes, whose dwellings may be required for the works by this Act authorised, and before displacing any person or persons belonging to the labouring classes, who may for the time being be the occupier or occupiers of any house or part of any house which the company are by this Act authorised to acquire, the company shall procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person or persons, unless the company and such person or persons otherwise agree. Provided always, that if any question shall arise as to the sufficiency of such accommodation the same shall be determined by a justice.

Metropolitan Railway Act, 1877.

In addition to the sections on pages 7 and 15 the following special Section is inserted in this Bill:—

28. The company shall erect upon some part or parts of the lands acquired by them under this Act in the parish of Holy Trinity, Minories, and the parish of St. Botolph Without, Aldgate, dwellings for the labouring classes, which shall be sufficient to accommodate an equal number of persons belonging to such classes as may be displaced by the company under the powers of this Act.

Metropolitan and District Railway (City Lines and Extensions) Act, 1879.

In addition to the sections on pages 7 and 15 the following special Section is inserted in this Act:—

47. The two companies shall erect upon some part or parts of the lands acquired by them under this Act in the parish of Holy Trinity, Minories, and the parish of St. Botolph Without, Aldgate, dwellings for the labouring classes, which shall be sufficient to accommodate an equal number of persons belonging to such classes as may be displaced by the two companies under the powers of this Act.

This is Extracted from the *Glasgow City Improvement Act*, 1866.

Section 23.—The trustees may, on any lands acquired by them under this Act, erect or maintain such dwelling-houses for mechanics, labourers, and other persons of the working and poorer classes as the trustees from time to time think expedient, and let the same, when so erected and fitted up, to such mechanics, labourers, and other persons of the working and poorer classes, at such weekly or other rents, and upon such terms and conditions as they from time to time think fit, or the trustees may sell and dispose of the same.

This is Extracted from the *Oldham Improvement Act*, 1880.

Section 207.—The corporation may, from time to time, if and when they think fit, appropriate any lands acquired by them, or under the powers of this Act, and which may not be required for the works and purposes by this Act authorised for the purpose of the erection of dwelling-houses or buildings for persons belonging to the labouring classes whose dwellings may be required for the works or purposes by this Act authorised, and before displacing any person or persons belonging to the labouring classes who may for the time being be the occupier or occupiers of any house or part of any house which the corporation are by this Act authorised to acquire, they shall procure sufficient accommodation elsewhere for such person or persons unless the corporation and such person or persons otherwise agree. Provided always that if any question shall arise as to the sufficiency of such accommodation the same shall be determined by a justice.

A CLAUSE, following almost word for word the undermentioned clause, and similar in effect, is found in the following Railway and other Acts.

Notice to be given of taking houses of labouring classes.

40. The Board shall, not less than eight weeks before they take in any parish 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partially by persons belonging to the labouring classes as tenants or lodgers, make known their intention to take the same by placards, handbills, or other general notice placed in public view upon or within a reasonable distance from such houses, and the Board shall not take any such houses until they have obtained the certificate of a justice that it has been proved to his satisfaction that they have so made known their intention.

The Metropolitan Street Improvements Act, 1872 -	Section 48
The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Act, 1876 - - - - - - - - - -	Section 25.
The East London Railway Act, 1876 - - -	Section 21.
The London and Blackwall Railway Act, 1876 -	Section 17.
The Midland Railway (New Lines, &c.) Act, 1876 -	Section 31.
The South Western Railway (Various Powers) Act, 1877 - - - - - - - - - -	Section 22.
The Great Northern Railway Act, 1877 - - -	Section 23.
The Great Western Railway Act, 1877 - - -	Section 24.
The Metropolitan Street Improvements Act, 1877 -	Section 48.
The London and North Western Railway Act, 1877,	Section 18.
The London and Blackwall Railway Act, 1877 -	Section 31.
The Metropolitan Railway Act, 1877 - - -	Section 13.
The Metropolitan District Railway Act, 1878 - -	Section 14.
The Midland Railway (Additional Powers) Act, 1878 - - - - - - - - - -	Section 21.
The Great Western Railway Act, 1878 - - -	Section 22.
The London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway (Various Powers) Act, 1879 - - - -	Section 14.
The East London Railway Act, 1879 - - -	Section 7.
The Great Eastern Railway Act, 1879 - - -	Section 18.
The Metropolitan and District Railways (City Lines and Extensions) Act, 1879 - - - - -	Section 45.

Appendix, No. 5.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Powell*, 30 March 1882.

TABLE showing NAMES of SOCIETIES and Number of Members.

Bookbinders, London Consolidated	858
„ Day Working	420
„ and Machine Rulers	180
Boot and Shoe Makers, Ladies' West End	240
„ „ „ City	300
„ „ „ Rivetters and Finishers	400
„ „ „ Closers, West End	60
Bakers, London Union	300
Basket Makers, London Union	200
Bricklayers, Operative	2,000
Cab Drivers, Amalgamated	600
Cabinet Makers, Alliance	800
„ „ West End	400
„ „ Progressive	100
Coopers, Philanthrophic	600
Cocoa Fibre Mat Makers	220
Carvers, Wood, Trade Society	100
„ Stone	197
Carpenters and Joiners, Perseverance	72
Cigar Makers' Mutual Association	1,000
Farriers, Amalgamated	288
Frame Makers (Composition and Ornamental)	50
Glass Blowers	180
Gas Meter Makers	144
Gilders, Hand-in-Hand	43
Gold Beaters	120
Hatters	700
Metal Workers	20
Masons, Operative	2,000
Millers, Amalgamated	108
Organ Builders	43
Painters and Decorators, Amalgamated	350
„ „ London Central	100
„ „ City	88
Pipe Makers, Tobacco	120
Portmanteau Makers	55
Polishers, French, East London	60
„ „ Metropolitan	96
Plasterers, Metropolitan	317
Sail Makers	104
Tin Plate Workers	500
Tobacco Strippers	116
Vellum Binders	324
Wire Workers	60
„ Weavers	50
Zinc Workers	60
TOTAL	15,143

Appendix, No. 6.

PAPER handed in by the Hon. Miss *M. Stanley*, 3 April 1882.

STATEMENT of the Actual Receipts and Disbursements of Three Houses.

12, Lichfield Street, Soho.

RECEIPTS.	£.	s.	d.	DISBURSEMENTS.	£.	s.	d.
1876:—Rents - - - - -	97	3	6	Six years' rent, at 67 *l.* 8 *s.* - -	404	8	–
1877 „ - - - - -	96	4	–	„ rates and taxes, 17 *l.* 10 *s.* -	103	–	–
1878 „ - - - - -	93	10	–	„ insurance - - -	6	–	–
1879 „ - - - - -	105	4	6	„ repairs - - - -	55	6	7
1880 „ - - - - -	110	10	–	„ rent collecting, 5 per cent. -	29	13	–
1881 „ - - - - -	90	18	6				
£.	593	10	6	£.	598	7	7

9, Market Street, Newport Market.

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
1879:—Rents - - - - -	76	2	6	Three years' rent, at 40 *l.* - -	120	–	–
				„ rates and taxes - -	41	8	–
1880 „ - - - - -	70	11	–	„ insurance - - -	2	12	6
				„ repairs - - - -	63	6	–
1881 „ - - - - -	61	11	6	„ rent collecting - -	10	8	–
£.	208	5	–	£.	237	14	6

5, Porter Street.

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
1879:—Rents - - - - -	85	16	6	Three years' rent at 48 *l.* 15 *s.* - -	145	5	–
				„ rates and taxes - -	41	8	4
1880 „ - - - - -	81	9	6	„ insurance - - -	2	12	6
				„ repairs - - -	63	3	3
1881 „ - - - - -	82	16	–	„ rent collecting - -	12	10	–
£.	250	2	–	£.	264	19	1

Weekly Rents received 1st April 1882.

12, Lichfield Street.		9, Market Street.		5, Porter Street.	
	s. *d.*		*s.* *d.*		*s.* *d.*
Kitchen - - -	3 –	Third Floor, front -	3 6	Third Floor (three rooms).	8 –
Back Parlour - -	3 6	Third Floor, back (empty).	–	Second Floor, front -	6 –
Shop (unlet) - -	–	Second Floor, front -	5 –	Second Floor, back -	4 –
First Floor - - -	8 6	Second Floor, back (free)	–	First Floor, front -	6 –
Second Floor - -	8 6	First Floor, front -	5 –	First Floor, back (no rent).	–
Third Floor, front -	4 6	First Floor, back room (now empty).	3 –	Parlour, front - -	6 –
Third Floor, back, furnished.	5 –	Shop and Kitchen let to the Metropolitan Board at - - -	10 –	Parlour, back (two rooms).	4 6

This is a statement of actual receipts and disbursements, but does not represent the real value of the three houses, as I have in the case of 5, Porter-street kept all the time a room for my own occupation of mission work. The room I kept was worth 6 *s.* 6 *d.* a week till the last year, when I have one worth 5 *s.* a week. In the case of 12, Lichfield-street I let the shop at a three years' lease to the National Penny Bank at a rent very considerably below the market value, in order that the bank should be established in Soho. I have, moreover, often allowed tenants in cases of sickness to remain in rent free, and the rents themselves, though average rents at the time I took the houses, are now much below the competitive rent, owing to the pressure for accommodation in consequence of the late demolitions. I must also add, the heavy items for repairs in the last two houses is owing to my having put them at first in a thorough state of sanitary repair, which heavy outlay would have lasted through my 21 years' leases.

I paid for these houses :—

	£.	*s.*	*d.*
Premium for 12, Lichfield-street - - - - - -	30	–	–
,, 9, Market-street - - - - - -	145	–	–
,, 5, Porter-street - - - - - -	240	–	–
Legal expense for purchase - - - - - -	28	8	–
£.	443	8	–

This sum of 443 *l.* 8 *s.* I should have been able to repay myself in the 21 years had I not been compelled to sell to the Metropolitan Board.

3 April 1882. *Maude Stanley.*

Appendix, No. 7.

PAPERS handed in by the Rev. *S. Barrett*, 3 April 1882.

List of Occupations of Tenants at George Yard Buildings, July 1881, built by Mr. Crowder.

Occupation of Tenant.	Number of Family.	Number of Rooms.	Rent. s.	Rent. d.
Composer and printer of street songs	6	1	3	6
Cobbler	3	1	3	6
Widow; flower-seller	2	1	2	–
Dock labourer; charwoman	4	1	3	3
Empty	–	–	3	3
Shell-fish hawker	1	1	3	6
Casual labourer	3	1	3	3
Brush makers	5	1	3	3
Cabinet-maker	4	1	3	3
Club-room	–	–	–	
Fruit-seller	4	1	3	6
Cobbler; converter of old coats	2	1	3	3
Casual labourer; son in post office	3	1	3	3
Painters' labourer; wife in prison	4	1	3	–
Sailor	3	1	3	–
Navvy	6	1	3	3
Casual job man	5	1	3	3
Sherbet hawker and flower seller	4	1	3	–
Cobbler	2	1	3	–
Shoeblack; job cook	2	2	4	9
Labourer; waistcoat maker	3	1	3	–
Charwoman; son labourer	2	1	3	–
Regular dock labourer	6	1	3	–
Casual man at printers; wife tailoress	7	1	3	3
Cab-driver; street seller	3	1	3	3
Cobbler	7	1	3	–
Carter	5	1	3	–
Cobbler	4	1	3	–
Labourer at waterworks	3	1	3	3
Brush-maker	–	–	–	
Bagpipe man	6	1	3	–
Casual	4	1	3	–
Painter	4	2	5	–
Carter; charwoman	4	1	3	3
Umbrella coverer	6	1	3	3
Cobbler	2	1	3	–
Christy minstrel	3	1	3	3
Cheap-jack	3	1	3	–
Carter	6	1	3	–
Frame-maker	6	1	2	9
Sailor	7	1	3	–
A "do nothing" wife, works at charing and washing; boys in work.	6	1	2	9
Odd job man; wife sells crotchet in streets.	4	1	2	9
Cage maker	5	1	2	9
Old couple ill, church work; daughter waistcoat hand.	5	2	4	–
Odd man; charwoman	4	1	3	–
Casual labourer; crotchet seller	4	1	2	9
Workhouse scrubber, widow	2	1	3	–
Crotchet hawker	4	1	3	–
Total	178			

New Buildings in George Yard, built by Mr. Crowder.

Cobblers	6
Fish, fruit, or flower sellers	5
Crotchet hawkers	3
Cheapjack	1
Brush-makers	2
Sailors	2
Street singers	2
Song hawker (representative of "literature.")	1
Carters	3
Shoeblack	1
Cabinet maker	1
Umbrella coverer	1
Frame-maker	1
Cage-maker	1
Workhouse scrubber	1
Cabman	1
Remainder casual labourers and charwomen.	

List of Occupations of Tenants at 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83, Wentworth-street, bought by Lord Pembroke.

Name.	Man's Work.	Woman's Work.	Number of Family,	House.		——
Fuller	-	-	4	78	Ground floor, front	Too ill to work; son, hawker.
				„	„ „ back.	
Miller	-	-	6	„	First floor, front.	
Bull (widow)	-	Occasional seamstress.	1	„	„ „ back.	
Power	Tailor	-	2	„	Second floor, front.	
Ferry (widow)	-	Sells clothes in "the Lane."	1	„	„ „ back.	
Peters (widow)	-	Workhouse scrubber.	4	„	Third floor.	
Moore	Matting weaver	-	3	79	Ground floor.	
Bender (widow)	-	Pickling	2	„	First floor, front.	
Byron	Wine cellarman	-	4	„	„ „ back.	
Donning	Sugar refining	-	4	„	Second floor, front.	
Barr (widow)	-	Charwoman	1	„	„ „ back.	
W. Barr	Labourer	-	6	„	Third floor.	
Sheen	Undertaker, fruit hawker	Occasional flower hawker.	4	80	Ground floor.	
Johnson (widow)	-	Occasionally nurses	3	„	First floor	Daughter in cotton factory; grandson, rag carrier.
Collicott	Railway porter	-	6	„	Second floor.	
Clipstone	Dock labourer	-	6	„	Third „	Leaving soon.
Bradshaw	Sawmill labourer	-	5	81	Ground floor, front.	
Neale	Fruit porter	-	2	„	„ „ back.	
Ragan	Orange porter	-	4	„	First floor.	
Brown	Chair hawker	-	5	„	Second floor, front.	
Pearson	Fancy packer	Umbrella maker	3	„	„ „ back.	
Cohen	Painter and glazier	-	5	„	Third floor.	
Cavanagh	Fruit hawker	Tailoress	8	82	Ground floor.	
Hogges	Paper ruler, cellarman	Glass duster	4	„	First „	One sister, two brothers, one aunt.
Titcombe	Builder at brewery	-	4	„	Second „	
Birchall	Porter, Leadenhall Market	Occasional charwoman.	5	83	Ground „	
Tracey	Wood porter (does not work).	Seamstress	4	„	First „	
Peckett (widow)	-	Housekeeper at office	1	„	Second floor, back	Leaving room soon.

List of Occupations of Tenants at Angel-alley, bought by Lord Pembroke.

NAME.	OCCUPATION.	Family.	Rooms.	Rent.
				s. *d.*
Bennett	Dock labourer; son, dock labourer; son, City sewers; son, chair maker.	5	1	3 9
Ware	Fish curer; wife works occasionally at fish curing	5	2	3 9
Hughes	Gas fitter	3	1	3 9
Simco	Shoeblack; wife hawks occasionally	4	1	2 9
Gettings	Shoeblack; wife hawks occasionally	4	1	3 6
Bennett	Widow, does slop-work; son works for an engineer	4	1	3 6
Smith	Dock labourer	2	1	2 9
Burton	Rice porter; wife superintendent of playground	5	1	3 8
Daniels	Hawker; wife, crochet work for shops; daughter, cigar factory; daughter, umbrella factory.	8	1	3 6
Howard	Collects and sorts paper; wife, ditto, and casual work.	2	1	2 9
Moore	Widow and daughter, makes sacks; two sons, casual work.	6	1	3 9
Finnigan	Widow, rag sorter; son, rag sorter	3	2	3 9
Anthony	Walking-stick maker	2	1	3 9
Lewis	Cocoanut fibre worker; son, ditto; wife, charwoman	6	1	3 6
Mallows	Painter	4	1	3 6
Bryan	Bricklayer	4	2	3 9
Schmidt	Bacon stall; daughter, casual work	4	1	3 6
Warrington	Blind man, sings; wife hawks occasionally	7	2	5 6
Cosgrove	Hawker	5	1	3 –
Manning	Dock labourer	5	1	3 6
Collins	Dock labourer	3	1	4 –
Joliffe	Carman	5	2	4 –
Donovan	Cocoanut fibre worker; wife hawks	10	2	4 –
Malins	Ticket porter at docks; wife chars; daughter an apprentice.	3	2	3 –

Appendix, No. 8.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Goddard*, April 1882.

AMENDED CONDITIONS OF SALE OF ARTIZANS' PLOTS AS FINALLY APPROVED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

First.—Each lot is offered for sale subject to a reserved price and the vendors reserve the right to bid by their agent If any dispute shall arise concerning any bidding for any lot such lot shall be immediately put up again at the last undisputed bidding Prints of the several Acts of Parliament schemes and orders mentioned in the note at the end of the particulars of sale may be inspected at the office of the Board (Solicitors' Department) during the usual office hours on any one of the three days next preceding the day fixed for the sale and the purchaser whether they inspect the same or not shall be taken to have full notice of the contents thereof.

Second.—No bidder shall advance a less sum at any bidding than that named by the auctioneer before the lot is put up nor retract any bidding.

Third.—The purchaser of each lot shall immediately after the sale sign a contract in the form annexed and at the same time pay to the auctioneer a deposit of 20 *l.* per cent. on the purchase-money The purchase of each lot shall be completed at the office in Spring Gardens of the Metropolitan Board of Works (the vendors) on the 17th day of May 1882 The purchaser shall on the completion of the purchase pay to the Board the balance of the purchase-money and all other moneys payable by him under these conditions and the Board will on payment to them of all such moneys as aforesaid and upon the execution and delivery to them by the purchaser of a duplicate execute and deliver to the purchaser a proper conveyance or assurance of the piece of land comprised in the lot bought by him and the fee simple thereof and the purchaser shall thereupon be entitled to the possession of such piece of land The said conveyance and duplicate shall contain such covenants by the purchaser for himself his heirs and assigns with the Board and their successors and such power to the Board and their successors to re-enter as are hereinafter mentioned that is to say—

(1) A covenant that the purchaser his heirs or assigns will within 12 calendar months after the date of the conveyance or within such other period as may be hereafter agreed upon between the parties or as failing such agreement may hereafter upon the application of either of them with notice to the other of them be fixed in that behalf by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the time being build and completely finish fit for immediate occupation on the land conveyed to the purchaser dwelling-houses or lodging-houses in brick or stone suitable for mechanics labourers and other persons of the working class within the meaning of the Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Improvements Acts 1875 and 1879 adequate to accommodate at least as regards Lot 1 200 persons and as regards Lot 2 315 persons as regards Lot 3 125 persons as regards Lot 4 125 persons as regards Lot 5 250 persons and as regards Lot 6 426 persons and built in accordance with such plans sections and specifications as shall have been first submitted by the purchaser his heirs or assigns to the Board or their successors and have been approved by them with the previous consent of the said Secretary of State or as in case of difference between the parties shall at the request of either with notice to the other be determined by the said Secretary of State provided that nothing in this covenant shall extend to make the purchaser his heirs or assigns liable to expend in building and completing such buildings as aforesaid greater sums than the following—that is to say as regards Lot 1 than 6,500 *l.* as regards Lot 2 than 8,000 *l.* as regards Lot 3 than 5,500 *l.* as regards Lot 4 than 5,500 *l.* as regards Lot 5 than 11,000 *l.* and as regards Lot 6 than 18,500 *l.* and provided that subject to proper accommodation with adequate light and air being afforded for the number of persons aforesaid to the satisfaction of the Board or their successors and the said Secretary of State the purchase his heirs or assigns shall be permitted to devote the basement and ground floor of the said buildings to use as shops or workshops or as storage places for trucks or barrows or goods used by or belonging to occupiers of the said buildings.

(2) A covenant that the purchaser his heirs or assigns will not at any time before the expiration of 10 years next after the date of the conveyance to the purchaser without having first obtained the consent of the Board or their successors in writing under their seal or in case of their refusal to give such consent or their failure so to

do

do for 28 days after application in writing made to them the written consent of the said Secretary of State erect or build or allow to be erected or built or suffer to be or remain on the land conveyed to the purchaser or any part thereof any building or erection whatsoever except such dwelling houses or lodging houses as aforesaid with their out offices walls fences yards and appurtenances built in accordance with the terms of the foregoing covenant (1) or allow the said land or any part thereof to be used in any other manner whatever than for the erection of such dwelling houses or lodging houses with the out offices walls fences yards and appurtenances thereto or allow any building or erection which may hereafter be built or erected on the said land or any part thereof to be used or occupied otherwise than as dwelling houses or lodging houses for mechanics labourers and other persons of the working class within the meaning of the said Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement Acts 1875 and 1879 except that subject as hereinbefore is provided the basements and ground floors of any such dwelling houses or lodging houses may be used as shops or workshops or storage places as aforesaid.

(3) A proviso that in case of any breach by the purchaser his heirs or assigns of the lastly hereinbefore mentioned covenant (2) the Board or their successors may at any time thereafter and from time to time so often as any such breach shall occur apply in writing signed by their clerk to the said Secretary of State for leave to re-enter upon the land conveyed to the purchaser or any specified part or parts thereof giving a like notice in writing to the purchaser his heirs or assigns of such application or posting the same to him by registered letter addressed to him at his usual or last known place of abode or business and the said Secretary of State may thereupon and upon being satisfied of the giving or posting of such notice as aforesaid and after hearing the parties by themselves or their agents or giving them reasonable opportunity of being so heard in his discretion either grant or refuse such application and either in whole or in part and subject to such terms and conditions (if any) as he may think fit and may at the request of either party certify in writing under his hand the fact of such grant or refusal and the particulars and extent thereof and the terms and conditions (if any) upon which the same shall have been made and on obtaining from the said Secretary of State a certificate as aforesaid that he grants either in whole or in part and subject or not subject to terms and conditions stated in such certificates on application of the Board or their successors to re-enter as aforesaid the Board or their successors may (but it shall not be obligatory on them) subject to the performance and observance of the terms and conditions (if any) specified in such certificates and to be performed and observed by them re-enter upon the lands specified in such certificates as those in respect whereof the application of the Board or their successors has been granted or any part thereof in the name of the whole and the same to have again re-possess and enjoy as of their former estate in as full free and unrestricted a manner as if the said conveyance to and contract with the purchaser had never been made and the purchaser his heirs and assigns and all other persons or bodies whomsoever and his and their goods chattels and effects thereout to expel and remove but nothing in this proviso shall take away lessen or prejudice any other right or remedy of the Board against the purchaser his heirs or assigns for breach of the foregoing covenants or either of them or the right of the Board or their successors to restrain the purchaser his heirs and assigns from any such breach or intended or threatened or continuing breach.

The said conveyance or assurance shall be prepared by and at the expense of the purchaser and shall be perused and executed by the Board at their expense The engrossment of such conveyance or assurance duly stamped shall be delivered to the Solicitor of the Board seven days at least before the day appointed for the completion of the purchase The purchaser shall on completion of the purchase execute and deliver to the Board a duplicate of such conveyance or assurance to be prepared by the Board at their expense and to be perused and executed by the purchaser at his expense The said conveyance is to be made subject to all rights of light way water or other easements (if any) affecting the land conveyed and particularly as regards Lot 1 the conveyance is to be made subject to any right of way which the owner lessee or occupier of the Philharmonic Theatre may now have or be entitled to over any portion of the lands comprised in such lot now or formerly forming the whole or part of Swan Yard or which is under the terms of the provisional order of the Home Secretary confirming the Metropolis (High-street Islington) Improvement Scheme 1877 to be maintained.

The Board shall not be required to enter into any covenant with the purchaser except the usual covenant by trustees that they have not incumbered.

Fourth.—If from any cause whatever the purchase of any lot shall not be completed on the day hereinbefore named for the completion thereof the purchaser shall pay interest at 5 *l.* per cent. per annum on the unpaid purchase money and other moneys then payable by him under these conditions from that day until the actual completion of the purchase provided that not nothing in this condition shall take away or prejudice the right of the Board to require specific performance by the purchaser of his contract or take away or prejudice the powers of the Board under the 8th condition or any other right or remedy they may have against the purchaser for breach of his contract Outgoings shall be paid by the Board to the day named for completion of the purchase and by the purchaser from that day and shall be apportioned if need be.

 Fifth.—The

Fifth.—The pieces of land to be sold have been acquired by the Board under the powers given them by the several acts and schemes mentioned in the note to the particulars of sale and the titles have been investigated by them and the Board shall not be required to furnish any abstract of their title or to show or produce or to give up or covenant to produce any title deeds or evidence of title or any evidence whatever of their right to convey and to receive and give a discharge for the purchase money and no objection or requisition shall be made to or upon the title of the Board or their right to convey and to receive and give a discharge for the purchase money and it shall be assumed without proof that the Board are the absolute owners in fee simple in possession of the said pieces of land subject only to the provisions of the acts schemes and orders mentioned in the said note to the particulars of sale and as regards Lot 1 to the right of way before mentioned and no proof shall be required of the accuracy of the statements in this condition.

Sixth.—The land comprised in each lot is believed to be correctly described and shown upon the plans hereto annexed and as the property is open to view no error of description or mis-statement in the particulars or plans or these conditions shall annul the sale or entitle a purchaser to compensation or abatement in purchase money.

Seventh.—If a purchaser shall make any objection or requisition whatever whether as to title conveyance or otherwise which the Board are unable or unwilling to comply with or remove and shall after being in writing required to waive the same refuse or neglect so to do the Board shall have power by resolution under their common seal to rescind the contract with such purchaser at any time notwithstanding any negociation or attempt that may have been made to remove or comply with such objection or requisition or any litigation in relation thereto and thereupon the Board shall repay to the purchaser his deposit money without interest costs or compensation.

Eighth.—If a purchaser shall fail to comply with the above conditions or any or either of them his deposit shall be forfeited to the Board who shall be at liberty to re-sell the property by public auction or private contract and the deficiency (if any) which may happen upon any such re-sale with all expenses incidental thereto shall on demand be made good by the defaulter at the present sale and be recoverable by the Board as and for liquidated damages.

Appendix, No. 9.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Rayner*, 24 April 1882.

BOROUGH OF LIVERPOOL.

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875.

Conditions of Sale.

1. The highest tenderer to be the purchaser if any tender be accepted, but the Corporation shall not be bound to accept any tender.

2. The purchaser of each lot shall, upon being declared so, immediately pay down in cash to the Corporation treasurer the sum of 10*l.* per cent. as a deposit, and in part satisfaction of the purchase-money, and enter into the contract annexed for payment of the remainder thereof and completion of the purchase (subject to the exercise of the option hereinafter contained) on or before the 1st day of October 1879. The purchaser, however, shall have the option, on payment of a further deposit of 10*l.* per cent., as hereinafter mentioned (instead of paying the remainder of the purchase-money in cash) of commuting the balance into the payment of a ground rent of 4*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* per cent. per annum on the remainder of the purchase-money, such ground rent to commence from the 1st day of July 1879, and to be payable half-yearly; *but* the purchaser intending to exercise this option shall give notice in writing of such intention to the town clerk within three calendar months from the day of sale, and shall pay to the treasurer a further deposit of 10*l.* per cent. on the day of giving such notice.

3. If any mistake or error shall be made in the description or admeasurement of the land, such mistake or error shall not annul the sale, but a compensation or equivalent shall be given or taken, as the case may require, such compensation or equivalent to be settled by the borough and water engineer.

4. The term shall be for 75 years, and shall commence on the 1st day of October 1879, and the lease shall contain such covenants and provisoes as are usually inserted and contained in the leases of lands granted by the Corporation, and particularly covenants—

(*a.*) To erect within two years from the time that possession is given to the purchaser on each of the lots buildings suitable for, and to be used only as, dwellings for the labouring classes according to plans and elevations, and with materials to be approved by the Corporation, and in conformity with all general and local Acts and bye-laws as modified by the Liverpool Improvement and Waterworks Act, 1871.

(*b.*) That in no case will the facing of any portion of the buildings with cement be allowed.

(*c.*) That the whole area of each dwelling be covered with asphalte or concrete impervious to water.

(*d.*) That every wall of such building shall have a damp course of asphalte, or slates laid in cement, or of other durable material impervious to moisture, below the level of the ground floor, and above the surface of the ground adjoining the wall.

(*e.*) That the heights of the respective buildings be limited to the heights marked on the lithographed plans.

(*f.*) That each dwelling be provided with a separate water-closet which shall not be entered directly from any habitable room, and that the passage or area from which such water-closet is entered shall at all times be in direct communication with the external air.

(*g.*) That the arrangements for the disposal of ashes and other refuse shall be subject in all respects to the approval of the health committee.

(*h.*) That the general arrangements of the dwellings, notwithstanding that they may comply with the Acts of Parliament and bye-laws in force in the borough, shall be subject to the approval of the health committee.

(*i.*) That every room shall have a fireplace and chimney flue.

 (*j.*) That

(*j.*) That every dwelling consisting of two or more rooms shall extend from the front to the back of the building.

(*k.*) That the ventilation of the buildings and of the drains, and the trapping and all other details of the drains, shall be to the satisfaction of the health committee.

(*l.*) To keep the premises in good repair, and rebuild in case of fire during the term, and to leave the premises in good repair at the determination of the lease.

(*m.*) Against letting or using any cellars for separate habitation.

(*n.*) Against erecting or using any building for the purpose of any trade or business, or otherwise than as a private dwelling-house, without the consent of the Corporation.

(*o.*) Against erecting or using an engine or other mechanical motive power.

(*p.*) Against erecting any additional building, and against any alteration or addition to any building, or the elevation thereof, without the consent and approval of the Corporation.

(*q.*) To permit the borough and water engineer to inspect the condition of the premises from time to time.

(*r.*) To insure the buildings (in case the option of commuting the balance of the purchase money into a ground rent shall be exercised) in the name of the Corporation, in such insurance office and for such sum, not being less than two-thirds of the full value of such buildings, as the Corporation shall approve, to deliver the policy of insurance to the Corporation, and to produce the annual receipts for the premiums to the Corporation before the time for payment expires.

(*s.*) That the Corporation shall have the usual powers of re-entry in case of breach of any lessee's covenant, or if the ground rent (if any) shall be in arrear for 28 days.

(*t.*) That the purchaser or lessee, his executors, administrators, or assigns, or his or their sub-lessee, shall not nor will at any time hereafter use or occupy, or cause, permit, or suffer any part of the said demised premises to be used or occupied or appropriated as an inn, ale-house, victualling-house, licensed refreshment-house, or beer-house, or for the sale of wines, spirits, ale, beer, or other intoxicating liquor to be consumed on or off the premises.

(*u.*) That each ground floor shall be not less than six inches and not more than nine inches above the highest part of the footway or open space adjoining the front or rear of the house to which it belongs.

(*v.*) That, notwithstanding anything contained in any Local or General Act, no protection shall be formed beyond the external face of any outer wall, with the following exceptions:—(*a*) window sills, which may project three inches and no more; (*b*) eaves or cornices which may project six inches and no more.

5. The purchaser shall not require or be entitled to any evidence of the title of the Corporation, nor any abstract thereof.

6. Every purchaser exercising the option of commuting the remainder of the purchase money into a ground rent, shall be entitled to possession of his or her lot, from the 1st day of October 1879, being the day on which the ground rent commences, subject to the stipulation contained in the 8th condition.

7. Purchasers not exercising the above option shall be entitled to enter into possession on the completion of the purchase. Provided that if the remainder of the purchase money be not paid on the said 1st day of October 1879, the Corporation may, *at their option*, charge the purchaser with interest, at the rate of 5*l.* per cent. per annum, giving the purchaser in such case the rents and profits (if any) from the day appointed for payment, or the deposit money shall be forfeited, and the Corporation shall be at liberty in such case, without notice, to re-assume their title, and re-sell the premises by auction or private contract, or by tender or otherwise, or not, *at their discretion*; and any deficiency or loss that may arise upon such re-sale, as aforesaid, with interest, shall be made good and paid to the Corporation by the person so making default; and the purchaser shall be, moreover, liable to an action for damages at the suit of the Corporation.

8. If the purchaser shall exercise the option of commuting the remainder of the purchase money into a ground rent, as provided by the second condition, such purchaser shall not be entitled to receive his or her indenture of lease unless and until the building or buildings, required to be erected, shall have been erected on the land, in accordance with the 4th condition, to the satisfaction of the Corporation.

9. Subject to all the above conditions being complied with, the whole area of each lot may be built upon.

10. The

10. The Corporation and the purchaser shall jointly bear the expense of stamping the annexed contract, and the purchaser shall be entitled, if it be required, to a copy of these conditions and of the contract at his own expense.

11. The several lots will be sold subject to all easements of light, rights of way, water, drainage, &c., to which the same may be subject.

12. When the land is sold the Corporation will fill it up to the proper levels, and will make the streets and open spaces.

13. Tenders endorsed "Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875, Tender for Purchase of Land," to be sent to the Town Clerk, Municipal Offices, Dale-street, Liverpool, on or before Monday, the 3rd March 1879.

The Contract.

_____ of _____

having tendered the sum of _____ shillings, and _____ pence, for every superficial square yard of land of and in Lot _____

_____

_____

subject to the foregoing conditions of sale, _____

_____ and the same having been accepted, doth hereby, for himself, his executors, and administrators, agree with the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the Borough of Liverpool, the sellers of the same, to accept a lease for 75 years thereof under the conditions aforesaid, and to pay the purchase money pursuant thereto, with interest as stated in the conditions, and to execute a counterpart of such lease, and to fulfil and comply with the said conditions in all respects.

As Witness the hands of the parties this _____ day of _____ One thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine.

WITNESS,

Amount of Purchase - - -
„ Deposit - - - -

Balance - - - £.

Appendix, No. 10.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Rayner*, 24 April 1882.

BOROUGH OF LIVERPOOL.

The Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875.

The Local Government Board's Provisional Orders Confirmation (Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings) Act, 1876.

Nash Grove Improvement Scheme.

List of Objections to the Provisional Award of Sir *Henry Arthur Hunt*, C.B., to be heard in the Grand Jury Room, St. George's Hall, Liverpool, on the 21st, 22nd and 23rd days of June, and on the 1877.

Consecutive No.	No. on Plan and Page of Provisional Award.	Names of Claimants (Owners).	Names of Claimants (Lessees or Occupiers).	Amounts of Provisional Award.	Day Fixed for Hearing.	Party Objecting.	Amounts of Final Award.	Solicitors for Claimants.
				£. s. d.			£.	
1	12—2	-	Jane Atkinson	50 – –	23 June	Claimant	120	—
2	52—2	-	John Boyd	100 – –	23 June	Both Parties	100	—
3	14—2	-	Anthony Bush	50 – –	23 June	Claimant	150	—
4	15 and 16—2	Thomas Haywood	-	2,040 – –	21 June	Both Parties	2,200	Messrs. Snowball, Copeman & Smith.
5	15—2	-	Thomas Leyland	50 – –	23 June	Claimant	124	—
6	16—2	-	Edward Haywood	750 – –	-	Both Parties	725	Messrs. Snowball, Copeman & Smith.
7	40—2	-	John Gresham	450 – –	23 June	Corporation	150	—
8	43—2	Thomas Houghton	-	270 – –	21 June	Claimant	320	Mr. Thomas Heald, Wigan.
9	44, 45, and 65 to 71—2	E. A. Barker	-	960 – –	21 June	Corporation	960	Mr. R. J. Jones.
10	53, 54, 55, 55a, 56, 82, and 83—3	Executors of Joseph Powell.	-	1,450 – –	21 June	Both Parties	1,320	Mr. Edward Williams.
11	53 and 54—3	-	Joseph Barraclough	30 – –	23 June	Claimant	30	—

12	56—3	-	Edward Jones	£ - -	23 June	Claimant	14	—
13	57, 84, and 88—3	Executors of Joseph Smith.	-	400 - -	22 June	Both Parties	400	—
14	58, 85, 86, 87—3	Executors of Joseph Smith.	-	450 - -	22 June	Both Parties	450	—
15	9c, 98, 99, 100 - - - 9d, 103, 104, 105 - - 9c, 109 to 114, 119, 120 - 9b, 117, 116 - - - 9a, 199, 241—4 - -	Charlotte M'Kee Churchill.	-	5,350 - -	- -	Corporation	5,350	Messrs. Field & Weightman.
16	199 and 241—4	-	Thomas Barton and James Archer.	50 - - 5 - -	23 June	Both Parties	250	Messrs. Stephens & Danger.
17	113—4	-	Joseph Shecklock	- - -	23 June	Claimant	100	—
18	106—4	-	Thomas Quayle	5 - -	23 June	Claimant	11	—
19	107—4	-	Thomas Lerman	5 - -	23 June	Claimant	5	—
20	108—5	Joseph Crabtree	-	860 - -	22 June	Both Parties	860	—
21	108—5	-	William Price	5 - -	23 June	Claimant	5	—
22	197—6	Mary Hall	-	640 - -	22 June	Corporation	640	Messrs. Yates, Son & Co.
23	200 to 207 and 233 to 240—6	Messrs. Benjamin	-	8,000 - -	- -	Both Parties	7,146	Messrs. Lewis & Lewis, 10, Ely-place, Holborn.
24	255—7	James Ruddin	-	3,000 - -	- -	Both Parties	3,260	Mr. Hugh Quinn.
25	256—7	-	Henry Blackhurst (Widow of).	5 - -	23 June	Claimant	10	—
26	263a, 263b, and 264—7	William Garlick	-	5,000 - -	- -	Corporation	4,400	Messrs. Collins & Robinson.
27	294 to 299, and part of 300—8	Joseph F. Marsh	-	360 - -	- -	Claimant	400	Mr. J. R. Buckton, Warrington.
28	304—9	-	Samuel Worthington	50 - -	- -	Claimant	200	—
29	—9	James Cooban	-	1,500 - -	- -	Both Parties	1,500	Messrs. Snowball, Copeman & Smith.

Note.—Cases fixed for 21st and not reached to be placed at the bottom of the List for the 22nd.

Appendix, No. 11.

PAPERS handed in by Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875.

STATEMENT showing the Rateable Value of the Metropolis and of the City; the Sums charged for Artizans' Dwellings in Annual Precept by the Metropolitan Board upon the Metropolitan Area outside the City; and the Amount the City would have had to contribute towards the Board's Expenditure if not excepted by Act of Parliament.

Estimate of	Rateable Value of the Metropolis, including the City.	Rateable Value of the City.	Amount Raised in Precept by the Metropolitan Board for Artizans' Dwellings.	Amount the City would have had to Contribute in Metropolitan Board Precept towards Artizans' Dwellings if charged with its Share.
	£.	£.	£.	£.
1878 - - - - -	23,584,728	3,048,567	5,992	775
1879 - - - - -	24,065,174	3,106,672	31,581	4,077
1880 - - - - -	24,605,926	3,216,701	47,686	6,234
1881 - - - - -	27,714,903	3,505,812	53,258	6,737
1882 - - - - -	27,520,627	3,500,968	78,528	9,990
		£.	217,045	27,823

Estimated Loss when all the schemes now in hand under the Artizans' Dwellings Act 1875, are complete - - - - - - - - £. 1,225,000

Amount which City would contribute if charged with its share, taking Rateable Value of 1882 as basis - - - - - - - - - - £. 155,835

Spring Gardens, S.W.,
8 June 1882.

Metropolitan Board of Works.—Artizans' Dwellings.

Receipts and Disbursements.

Gross Account.

Year.	Receipts each year.			Disbursements each year.
	Raised on Security of Metropolitan Consolidated Stock.	Other Receipts, such as Sales, Rents, Costs Recovered, and Incidentals.	Total.	
	£.	£.	£.	£.
1875 - - - -	- -	- -	- -	321
1876 - - - -	- -	- -	- -	10,759
1877 - - - -	30,000	113	30,113	19,196
1878 - - - -	380,500	2,725	383,225	163,343
1879 - - - -	300,000	6,795	306,795	283,543
1880 - - - -	150,000	37,414	187,414	428,168
1881 - - - -	500,000	73,643	573,643	464,761
£.	1,360,500	120,690	1,481,190	1,370,091
Balance in hand, 31st December 1881 - - -				111,099
			£.	1,481,190

Net Account.

	£.
Disbursements as above - - - - - - - - -	1,370,091
Receipts from Sales, &c. - - - - - - - - -	120,690
Net Expenditure to 31st December 1881 - - - £.	1,249,401
Loan Raised - - - - - - - - - - -	1,360,500
Balance in hand, 31st December 1881 - - - - £.	111,099

Spring Gardens, 9 June 1882.

Appendix, No. 12.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *Shaw Lefevre.*

RETURN showing the Number of Inhabited Houses and the Population in each of the Years 1851, 1861, 1871, and 1881, in the City of London, Metropolitan Police District (excluding City), and London within Limits of Metropolis Local Management Act.

	1851.	1861.	1871.	1881.
City of London:				
Inhabited houses - - -	14,580	13,298	9,305	6,493
Population - - - -	127,869	112,063	74,897	50,526
Metropolitan Police District (excluding City):				
Inhabited houses - - -	No Return	421,232	519,499	639,325
Population - - -	- ditto -	3,110,657	3,810,744	4,713,786
London within Limits of Metropolis Local Management Act:				
Inhabited houses - - -	No Return	360,065	419,642	488,995
Population - - - -	- ditto -	2,808,862	3,266,987	3,832,441

Appendix, No. 13.

PAPER, in explanation of Mr. *Ashby's* Evidence on Questions 132 to 136, and sent to the *Chairman* by him.

Offer of 1,250 *l.* a year is equal to about 4 *d.* a foot on the net area, or 3 *d.* a foot on the gross area.

The same (net) area at 2 *s.* a foot rental = 7,500 *l.*

	Feet.
Area cleared (approximately):—	
Golden Lane - - - - - - - - -	54,000
Petticoat Square - - - - - - - -	79,000
	133,000
Deduct, area of public ways (courts and alleys) demolish	22,000 about.
	111,000
Space lettable now :—	
Building area and yards—Golden Lane - - -	32,000
Ditto - ditto Petticoat Square -	42,000
	74,000

Appendix, No. 14.

PLAN handed in by Mr. *Goddard*, 19 June 1882.

(*See* PLAN opposite.)

Appendix, No. 15.

PLAN handed in by Mr. *Goddard*, 19 June 1882.

(*See* PLAN opposite.)

Appendix, N° 14.

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS, ACT 1877.

WESTERN IMPROVEMENTS.

PARISH OF ST JAMES WESTMINSTER

PARISH OF ST ANNE SOHO

PARISH OF ST GILES IN THE FIELDS

PARISH OF ST MARTIN IN THE FIELDS

REGENT CIRCUS SOUTH

REGENT STREET

GLASSHOUSE STREET

DENMAN STREET

TICHBORNE STREET

WINDMILL STREET

GREAT

ARCHER STREET

ARGYLL ROOMS

ST PETER'S CHURCH

RICHMOND STREET

RUPERT STREET

JERMYN STREET

HAYMARKET

COVENTRY STREET

ARUNDEL STREET

ARUNDEL PLACE

OXENDON STREET

PRINCES STREET

NEWBEY ALLEY

NEW COVENTRY ST

LEICESTER STREET

LISLE STREET

LEICESTER PLACE

LEICESTER SQUARE

RYDERS COURT

LITTLE NEWPORT STREET

EARLS COURT

CRANBOURNE STREET

BEAR STREET

CASTLE STREET

ORANGE STREET

GREEN STREET

HEMMINGS ROW

ST MARTIN'S PLACE

CHANDOS STREET

ST MARTIN'S CHURCH

DURCANNON STREET

TRAFALGAR SQUARE

NATIONAL GALLERY

CHARING CROSS

STRAND

ST MARTIN'S LANE

NEW STREET

CECIL COURT

CARRICK STREET

LONG ACRE

UPPER ST MARTIN'S LANE

NEWPORT ST

DEAN STREET

FRITH STREET

CHURCH STREET

KING STREET

MACCLESFIELD STREET

NASSAU STREET

GERRARD STREET

GEORGE YARD

CHAPEL PLACE

LITTLE COMPTON STREET

MOOR STREET

CRAFTON STREET

PRINCES ROW

MARKET STREET

LICHFIELD STREET

WEST STREET

PORTER STREET

SUTTON ST

FALCONBERG PLACE

ROSE STREET

DENMARK STREET

DENMARK PLACE

CLOVER COURT

PHŒNIX STREET

NEW COMPTON STREET

STACEY PASSAGE

DUDLEY STREET

LITTLE EARL STREET

GREAT WHITE LION STREET

GREAT ST ANDREW STREET

BROAD STREET

LUMBER COURT

TOWER STREET

SEVEN DIALS

LITTLE ST ANDREW STREET

QUEEN STREET

KING STREET

LITTLE WHITE LION STREET

EARL STREET

CASTLE STREET

NEW OXFORD STREET

ARTHUR STREET

HIGH HOLBORN

OXFORD ST

TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD

ST GILES CHURCH

GEORGE STREET

BAPTIST CHAPEL

BLOOMSBURY STREET

THORNEY ST

ST GEORGE DUKE

BLOOMSBURY STREET

VINE STREET

MUSEUM STREET

ENDELL STREET

PARISH OF SAINT GEORGE BLOOMSBURY

PARISH OF SAINT GILES IN THE FIELDS

Reference.

The Property decided to be taken exclusive of that required for the Streets is colored Red.

The Blue color shows sites for Artizans Dwellings.

SCALE.

Feet 100 50 0 100 200 300 400 500 Feet.

Appendix, No. 15.

METROPOLITAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS, ACT 1877.

GRAYS INN ROAD IMPROVEMENT.

The lines on this Plan marked **No1** *and* **No2** *shew; the centre lines of the Widening designated* **No1** *and New Street designated* **No2** *respectively, and the lines on which the Sections with corresponding numbers are taken.*

The following public or private Streets and Ways are to be stopped up and their sites appropriated, namely the South West Side of Cold Bath Square. Bath Court.— Lanes Court,— Baynes Court,— Tothill Street,— and Little Grays Inn Lane.

The dotted line marked "Limits" denotes the proposed limits of lateral deviation from the several lines of the proposed work and also the limits of the lands and property to be acquired.

Appendix, No. 16.

Memorandum by Mr. Bryce.

While travelling in the United States last autumn, I made some inquiries regarding the efforts which benevolent persons have made there to provide, not as a matter of charity, but on a commercial basis, improved dwellings for the poor. The facts stated were interesting and encouraging, but the problem which the Committee has to deal with depends too largely on English statutes to make American experience bear directly upon it, or to justify me in submitting those facts to the Committee in detail. I shall not, therefore, attempt to do more than notice a few points which may serve to throw some light on the working of those voluntary agencies for the improvement of the dwellings of the labouring class, regarding which questions were frequently addressed to the witnesses who appeared before the Committee.

1. The experience both of Boston and of Brooklyn, great cities in which land is costly, and there exists a large population on the verge of panperism, confirms the experience of England that dwellings for working people of all classes down to the poorest can be made to pay, and to pay well. In the Brooklyn blocks of tenement houses a gross profit of 13 per cent. is earned, of which 2 per cent. go in taxes, 2 per cent. in repairs, 1 per cent. in expenses, while of the remaining 8 per cent., 2 per cent have been hitherto applied to the extension and improvement of the dwellings, and 6 per cent. to dividend.

2. American experience is strongly in favour of using the ground floor of these dwellings for shops. A better rent is obtained for such shops than could generally be had for others in the neighbourhood, because the inhabitants of the upper stories of the blocks form a considerable body of customers, and thus the income from the whole block is increased.

3. Much weight is laid by the managers of these American artizans' dwellings on the desirability of providing a considerable number of small tenements, consisting of one or two rooms only. The poorest class to be benefited consists of single women or widows with a child or two, and for these, small sets, consisting of a room or two small rooms, varying in rent according to size and height from the ground, are much needed. The advantage over ordinary lodging houses is that the construction of these blocks makes it possible to give more privacy than a single room in such an ordinary house could give.

4. Some of my American informants (and particularly several ladies who have in Boston devoted themselves to this work) insisted strongly on the desirability, especially in districts where it is hard to get ground enough to erect a large block, of procuring two or three houses in an ordinary street, and letting them, after some cleaning and repairs, as dwellings for the poor. They declare that by this means, available to any single benevolent person (as Miss Octavia Hill's example has successfully shown here), not only are the inmates of the improved houses benefited, but a good influence is produced in the neighbourhood both on landlords and on tenants.

5. In the Brooklyn dwellings a reading-room and small library have been established for the use of the tenants. The cost is small, and the effect excellent.

6. Admirable results have been found to flow in the case of the Brooklyn dwellings (managed by a very energetic and public spirited man, Mr. Alfred T. White), from the plan of giving a discount upon the payment of rents. All rents are required to be paid in advance, and a double discount is given, one of 10 per cent. to those who pay four weeks or more in advance at one time, a second, also of 10 per cent., to those who remain during a whole year, from 1st May to 1st May. This second discount about represents the saving to the proprietors from not having frequent changes of tenants, since each of such changes involves some amount of damage and trouble. Thus the good tenant is benefited, and is not required to pay for the bad one. One fourth of the tenants in the Brooklyn blocks have, in every year, regularly taken advantage of the first of these discounts, and another fourth have done so to a considerable extent.

J. Bryce.

INDEX

TO THE

REPORT

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

ARTIZANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, *to be Printed*,
19 *June* 1882.

ANALYSIS OF INDEX.

List of the Principal Headings in the following Index, with the Pages at which they may be found.

PAGE

Acts of 1875 *and* 1879 (*Artizans' Dwellings Acts*) - - - - - - - - - 241

Appeals - - - - - - - - - - 242

Arbitration - - - - - - - - - 242

City of London (*Golden Lane and Petticoat Square*):

1. *Explanations on the part of the City Commissioners of Sewers relative to the Action taken, or proposed to be taken, in respect of the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square Schemes; Difficulties in view of the heavy Cost involved* - - - - - 247
2. *Dense Population in the Petticoat-lane District; Demand for Empty Rooms* - - - - - - 248
3. *Prejudicial Effect of Clearances as regards the local Tradespeople, and as regards many of those Displaced* 248
4. *Unhealthiness of the People in the more crowded Localities* - - 248
5. *Particulars relative to the Arbitration and Compensation in the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square Schemes* - - - - - - 248
6. *Rateable Value of the City; Amount of excepted Liability in respect of Expenditure of the Metropolitan Board for Artizans' Dwellings* - 248
7. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee* - - - 248

Clerkenwell - - - - - - - - 248

Closing and Demolition of Insanitary Houses - 249

Compensation:

1. *Total Compensation awarded under Arbitration; Total agreed to in direct Settlement by the Metropolitan Board* - - - - - 250
2. *Limited Value allowed in respect of Tenements unfit for Habitation* - 250
3. *Practice as to Compensation for Trades* - - - - - - 250
4. *Weekly Tenants* - - - - - 250
5. *Long Tenancies* - - - - - 251
6. *Question of Money Compensation to Tenants in lieu of the Provision of New Dwellings* - - - - - 251
7. *Other Details and Suggestions generally* - - - - - - 251
8. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee* - - - 252

Conditions of Sale or Lease - - - - 252

Cost (*Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879) - - - - 252

Costermongers - - - - - - - 253

Costs - - - - - - - - - - 253

PAGE

Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses - - - - 254

Displacement and Replacement of Population:

1. *Operation of the Act of* 1875, *and of the Acts of* 1872 *and* 1877, *as regards the Local Accommodation, or the Dispersion, of the People displaced by the Clearance of any Area* - - - - - - - 255
2. *Extent to which important that those displaced should be Re-housed in the same Locality, or in the immediate Vicinity of their Work* - 255
3. *Question of replacing the entire Number displaced; Expediency of Relaxation of the Restrictions on this Point* - - - - - - 256
4. *Conclusions of the Committee; Relaxations recommended* - - 256

Empty Houses - - - - - - - - 257

Gray's Inn Road:

1. *Present Condition of the Gray's Inn Road Improvement; Difficulties through the Restrictions under the* 33*rd Section of the Act of* 1877 - 268
2. *Question as to the Accommodation provided, or to be provided, for the People displaced* - - - - 268
3. *Question as to the Mode of dealing with the Cleared Area; Rearrangements proposed as to Sites, so as to obviate the Great Cost under existing Restrictions* - - 269

Great Eastern Railway (*Workmen's Trains*) 269

Hackney - - - - - - - - - 270

Holborn District - - - - - - - - 272

Islington (*Essex-road Scheme*) - - - - - 276

Liverpool - - - - - - - - - 278

Local Authorities - - - - - - - - 279

Marylebone - - - - - - - - - 280

Metropolitan Board of Works:

1. *Action generally of the Board under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; Progress made with the several Schemes* - - - - - - 280
2. *Question of the Board providing Buildings for the Lower Classes displaced by Improvement Schemes* 280

Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts 281

Model Dwellings - - - - - - - - 282

PAGE

Old Pye-street (Westminster) - - - 283

Overcrowding - - - - - - - 283

Owners - - - - - - - - - 283

Peabody Trust:

1. *Progress being made by the Trustees in the Erection of Dwellings on the Sites purchased from the Metropolitan Board* - - - 284
2. *Consideration of the Terms on which Sites were sold to the Trustees* - 284
3. *Character of the Accommodation; Respect in which unsuited to the lower grade of the Working Classes* - - - - - 285
4. *Rules and Restrictions* - - 285
5. *Rents* - - - - - - - 285
6. *Conclusions of the Committee* - 185

Private Enterprise - - - - - 287

Rates and Ratepayers - - - - - 287

Rents - - - - - - - - - 289

Schemes (Acts of 1875 and 1879) - - - 291

Sites (Improved Dwellings):

1. *Increased Value of the Areas or Sites acquired by the Metropolitan Board under Improvement Schemes if they could be made available for Commercial Purposes* - - - 292

PAGE

Sites (Improved Dwellings)—continued.

2. *Difficulties in the Acquisition of Alternative Sites in London for the purpose of Artizan's Dwellings* - 292
3. *Particulars relative the several Sites hitherto acquired, the Area, Cost, &c.* - - - - - - 292

Southwark and Great Dover-street Schemes - 293

Suburbs:

1. *Conflicting Evidence on the question as to the Desire of Working Men to live in the Suburbs rather than in London, and as to the Advantage of their doing so* - - - - 294
2. *Extent and Character of the Accommodation in the Suburbs for the Working Classes; Expediency of Street Sanitary Regulations* - 295

Torrens' Acts - - - - - - - 296

Western Improvements Scheme - - - 300

Whitechapel and Limehouse:

1. *Particulars in connection with the Arbitration in the Whitechapel Scheme* - - - - - - 301
2. *Estimates and Cost* - - - 301
3. *Conditions of Sale or Lease of Land* 301
4. *Other Particulars generally on various Points* - - - - 301

Workmen's Trains - - - - - - - 302

INDEX.

[*N.B.*—In this Index the Figures following the Names of the Witnesses, and those in the Analysis of Evidence of each Witness, refer to the Questions in the Evidence; the Figures following *App.* refer to the Pages in the Appendix; and the Numerals following *Rep.* to the Pages in the Report.]

A.

ABREY, THOMAS. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness, who is a carpenter and joiner, lives in Holloway, being at present in the employment of a builder in the New North-road, 2575-2578. 2619-2623. 2633-2636——He submits various suggestions and representations, on the part of the London Trade Council and in support of the views set forth in the Paper laid before the Committee by Mr. Powell, 2579 *et seq.*

Objections to the removal of the working classes to the suburbs, if convenient houses can be erected for them on or near the sites whence they are displaced; increased cost of living in the suburbs on account of the distance from markets, 2579-2584. 2601-2607. 2637-2648——Recommendation that workmen's trains should run from 5 a.m. to 8 a.m., and that the fare should be limited by Parliament to 1 *s.* a week, 2585-2587. 2597-2600. 2608, 2609. 2624-2626——Complaint that in the Industrial Dwellings the bedrooms are too small; superiority of the Huntingdon Dwellings in every particular, 2588-2590. 2627, 2628.

Decided opinion that the buildings erected in the suburbs by private persons are not properly surveyed; necessity for carrying out the Building Acts much more stringently in the suburbs, 2591. 2629-2632——Conclusion that in the case of persons who have been dispossessed and who are employed at a distance, it would not be necessary to provide local accommodation for them, as they could be accommodated in the suburbs, 2601-2604.

Belief that there is not much ground for complaint in regard to the distance preventing a man from having his meals at home; it is the rule for working men to have their meals away from home, 2605——Disapproval of compensating persons who have been dispossessed, by means of a money payment, 2615——Strong desire on the part of the working classes to become house-owners; numerous instances of men joining Building Societies, 2616-2618.

Acts of 1872 *and* 1877 (*Metropolitan Street Improvements*). See *Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts.*

Acts of 1875 *and* 1879 (*Artizans' Dwellings Acts*):

Opinion that the Act of 1875 has worked most beneficially in the public interests, but that the machinery of the Act is too cumbrous, too dilatory, and too expensive, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 184. 192——Witness has not yet acted as arbitrator under the Amendment Act of 1879, though in the Little Coram Street Scheme the third section will be applied; he has already formed his opinion as to the proper interpretation of this clause, *ib.* 229-232.

Suggestion that the third section of the Act of 1879 might be usefully amended by requiring the jury or arbitrator in each case to state that in giving a certain sum for compensation they had taken into consideration so much for the cost of repairing the premises, *Goddard* 681-683——Suggestion also that this section might be further amended by the jury or arbitrator being required to state the amount allowed for the abatement of any nuisance proved to exist, *ib.* 683-688.

Consideration of the interpretation of section 4 of the Act of 1879 as to relaxation by the Home Secretary in the event of sufficient accommodation being available outside the area embraced in the scheme, *Goddard* 689-692.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Acts of 1875 *and* 1879 (*Artizans' Dwellings Acts*)—continued.

Result of witness' experience as regards Glasgow that he has been strongly of opinion since 1877 that the Metropolitan Board of Works could have carried out improvements much more effectually and economically but for the restrictions under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; he has not directly advised the Board to this effect, *Grant* 738, 739. 759-779——Paper submitted in explanation of witness' views upon the general question of the working of the Acts, and the unsoundness of the principles sought to be enforced by their provisions, *Grant* 739, 740; *App.* 205-207.

Opinion that the blot in the working of the Act of 1875 is that arbitrators and juries have not sufficiently taken into consideration the dilapidated state of the property, *Walker* 1066-1069——Amendment contemplated in clause 19 of the Act upon the foregoing point, *ib.* 1070——Question also whether clause 3 of the Act of 1879 should not be amended, *ib.* 1071, 1072.

Valuable operation of the Act of 1879, though increased powers are necessary in the Metropolitan Board, *Tripe* 1975, 1976. 2000-2010. 2016——Strong approval of the working of the Acts of 1875 and 1879; belief that if properly carried out the condition of the working people will be improved both socially and morally, *Miss Stanley* 2857——Satisfactory working of the Act of 1875; great importance of considering the details of each case, *Miss Hill* 2996-2998——Reasons for preferring the machinery of the Act of 1875 to the ordinary process under the Land Clauses Acts, *Rayner* 3455, 3456.

Summary by the Committee of the main objects and provisions of the Acts of 1875 and 1879; important difference between these Acts and the Acts of Mr. Torrens in 1868 and 1879, *Rep.* iv, v——Value attached to the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, as well as to Mr. Torrens' Acts, as being available for their own particular purpose, and as being alike necessary and useful, *ib.* v.

Summary of the operation of the Acts of 1875 and 1879 in the metropolis, showing the areas dealt with, the cost, recoupment, &c., *Rep.* v, vi.

Conclusion of the Committee that a short Amending Bill of the Acts of 1875 and 1879 should at once be brought into Parliament, with a view to carrying out certain relaxations and alterations recommended by the Committee, *Rep.* xiii.

See also *the Headings generally throughout the Index.*

Appeals. Outline of the proceedings proposed when, as suggested by witness, the local authority has received power to proceed with any scheme; any claimant electing to go before the standing arbitrator instead of before a jury must abide by the result without any appeal whatever, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 197-199——Proposal that if claimants neglect or refuse to go before the arbitrator the latter should be empowered to proceed *ex parte* and make his award, without any power of appeal; reference hereon to the course pursued in the Birmingham case, *ib.* 198, 199.

Total of only six cases in which there have been appeals to a jury out of all the schemes of the Metropolitan Board of Works; amount of the claim, of the award, and of the verdict of the jury in each case, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 204-210——Prospect of appeals decreasing as the principle of arbitration is better understood; hitherto this has not been the result in witness' experience, *ib.* 380-383——There have been only two appeals in the Golden-Lane Scheme, though the amount involved in this scheme is 213,000 *l.*, *ib.* 397.

Approval of the appealable limit being 500 *l.* rather than 1,000 *l.*; under witness' scheme it would not be necessary to fix any sum, as there should be no appeal from the jury or from the arbitrator, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 398, 399. 460-462.

Double expense under the present system of appeal; opinion that the appeal to the arbitrator should be final, *Goddard* 659-666.

Statement showing the number of cases heard on appeal in respect of each of the schemes dealt with by Sir Henry Hunt as arbitrator, *App.* 197——Net result of jury appeals in respect of each scheme, *ib.* 199.

Recommendation by the Committee that the appeal to a jury in matters of compensation, which is now allowed when the amount in dispute exceeds 500 *l.*, should not be allowed except in those cases where the amount exceeds 1,000 *l.*; *Rep.* viii.

Arbitration. Witness, who has had a very long and extensive experience as a surveyor, has acted as arbitrator in fifteen schemes under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act of 1875, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 173-183.

Paper submitted showing the date of appointment of witness in the different schemes, the date of publication of his provisional and final awards, the aggregate sums awarded in respect of each scheme, and the costs, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 185; *App.* 197.

Single instance in the case of Wolverhampton of any exception having been taken to witness' charges as arbitrator; appeal in this case to the Local Government Board, who decided that they had no jurisdiction, after which the charges were paid in full,

Sir

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Arbitration—continued.

Sir H. A. Hunt 188. 191——Grounds for the suggestion that in future the arbitrator's charges should beyond doubt be supervised by the confirming authority under the Act, *ib.* 188–191.

Great care taken by witness in his arbitrations, both sides being duly heard, and the present condition and letting value of the property being fully considered in his awards, so that he may not be too liberal in his compensations, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 226–228——Advantage of a variety of arbitrators rather than of one or two standing arbitrators, *ib.* 383.

Satisfactory character on the whole of the awards made under the Act of 1875, *Walker* 1065, 1066.

Expediency of its being left to the arbitrator to deal separately with each property on its individual merits, *Rep.* vii.

Opinion of the Committee that the salary or remuneration, travelling and other expenses of the arbitrator, should be certified by the confirming authority before payment by the local authority, *Rep.* viii.

See also *Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879. *Appeals. Compensation. Cost. Costs. Liverpool. Provisional Award.*

Areas or Sites (Acts of 1875 *and* 1879). See *Sites.*

Artizans' Dwellings Improvement Company. Approval of the buildings erected by Sir Sydney Waterlow's Company; good sanitary arrangements in force, *Gibbon* 1898.

Ashby, Edward Eyre. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Statement as to nothing having been done by the City Commissioners of Sewers since last Session under the Act of 1875 in the way of pulling down houses, the ground having already been cleared in the case of the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square sites, 1–7——Absence of any communication between the City authorities and the Home Secretary since last Session upon the question of certain relaxations and facilities, so as to lessen the expense of carrying out the intentions of the Act of 1875; 9, 10.

Explanation more especially as to active steps not having been taken by the City Commissioners of Sewers since the Report of the Committee of last Session with regard to the relaxation of the conditions for letting the land on the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square sites, 11 *et seq.*——Intended application on the part of the City authorities to the Home Secretary in October last for permission to adopt certain relaxations; this was not proceeded with owing mainly to the Golden-lane area having been scheduled for railway purposes, 12–14. 27——Postponement of action respecting the Petticoat-square area in the hope that the inquiry before the present Committee would facilitate modifications being obtained, 13. 15–28.

Exceedingly heavy loss being incurred by the city in connection with the areas in question, the ground having been cleared at an immense cost, whilst there is great difficulty in letting the land, though it has been frequently advertised, 16–45——Doubt as to there having been any irregularity in the clearance of the ground, 18–20. 67, 68——Cost of more than 100,000 *l.* for the Golden-lane site; conditional offer of 410 *l.* a year recently received for this land, 25. 33. 93——Proposal now being put forward that the Court of Common Council shall negotiate with the Commissioners of Sewers with reference to the disposal of the land, 29.

Clearance of the two areas in the city about two years ago, whereas it has not yet been found feasible to let either of the sites, 30–45. 58——Summary of the proceedings of the Commissioners of Sewers respecting the areas in question since the Report of the Select Committee of 1881; 33——Limited success of the Metropolitan Board in letting the areas cleared by them; that is, much of their land is still in hand, 36, 37. 99–101.

Estimate of about 2 *s.* a foot as the commercial value of the land if freed from the conditions of the Act of 1875; 38–42——Importance attached to the relaxations recommended by the Committee of 1881, though hitherto the steps taken with a view to letting have not been successful, 43–45——Explanation as to the continued liability of the city through the Common Poor Fund of the metropolis in respect of the poor removed from the areas in question, 46–57. 96–98.

Unsuccessful attempt to bring in some land at Holloway for artizans' dwellings, so as to utilise the cleared land for commercial purposes, 59–61——Full expectation of the Petticoat-square site being dealt with for reinstating the people displaced, 62–65——Inability of the city to deal with the Golden-lane site, it having been scheduled for a railway, 66.

Further examination as to the course pursued by the city authorities in not selling nor letting either of the cleared areas; that is, by reason of the utterly inadequate offers received, and in view of the approaching termination of the present inquiry, 69 *et seq.*——Excellent block of buildings erected by the corporation in Farringdon-road, the land having been bought from the Clerkenwell Improvement Trustees, and a return of 4 per

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Ashby, Edward Eyre. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

cent. being derived; reason for not following this precedent in respect of the Golden-lane or Petticoat-square sites, 73, 74. 83–90.

Increased difficulty of dealing with the Petticoat-square area by reason of the heavy tithe upon it under the City Tithe Act of last Session, 75–82——Immense depreciation in the present value of any buildings erected on this site on account of the existing restrictions; grounds for this conclusion, 79–82. 115–117. 123–125——Explanation in connection with a project for erecting buildings at Holloway near the Cattle Market; reference hereon to the number and class of houses recently put on the adjoining land, 82. 115–125.

Great loss being incurred through the capital expended in clearing the land being entirely unproductive; justification nevertheless of the refusal of the city authorities to accept 3 *d.* a foot or to sell at twenty years' purchase on this basis, 89–95. 113, 114. 126–137——Reason assigned for not making application to the Secretary of State for a relaxation of restrictions as to the provision of shops, &c., so as to obtain more favourable offers, 102–114.

Witness is not prepared to say what loss the Commissioners of Sewers are prepared to incur in respect of the sites in question, 126–137——Probable avoidance of any loss if the land might be let for commercial purposes so as to produce 2 *s.* a foot, 132–135.

B.

Baldwin's Gardens (*Gray's Inn-road*). Consideration of the question whether the people displaced from the district about Baldwin's Gardens could conveniently remove to a distance or to the suburbs; great facility if there were penny railway fares from and to the suburbs for these people, *Reid* 914–934.

Information relative to the occupations of tenants in Baldwin's Gardens; large proportion not employed locally, about two-fifths being so employed, *Walker* 991. 1040–1044——Further reference to the experience obtained in the case of Baldwin's Gardens, where about 40 per cent. of the people are locally employed, *ib.* 1174–1178.

See also *Gray's Inn-road.*

Barnett, The Rev. Samuel Augustus. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has resided in St. Jude's Vicarage, Whitechapel, for over nine years, and has had special opportunities for judging of the condition of the people in that parish, 3008–3011.

Extremely low class of poor living in Whitechapel; street occupations are their chief mode of earning their living, 3012–3015——Considerable difference between the people who occupy the nightly common lodging-houses, and the decent working people who live in single rooms, 3016–3022——Statement as to the amount of rent paid respectively for single rooms and for nightly lodgings, 3023–3030——Strong reasons for the opinion that the poor in Whitechapel cannot afford to separate; remarkable manner in which they help each other when in and out of work, 3034–3036. 3115–3117.

Bad state of health and morals in the Goulston-street and the Flower and Dean-street areas, 3037–3039——Futile efforts made to improve the neighbourhood under Mr. Torrens' Acts before the passing of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; disinclination of the vestry to do anything for the improvement of the dwellings, as they had not power of giving compensation to the owners, 3040–3044. 3106–3110. 3150–3164. 3184–3186.

Decided opinion that in the administration of the Acts reconstruction should take place as rapidly as possible; demolition of houses of a fairly good character in George-yard, 3045–3054. 3216——Unsatisfactory system of giving money compensation to the tenants a long time before they leave, 3055, 3056——Necessity for reconstruction in the same neighbourhood as that in which the demolition takes place; opinion that provision need not be made for re-housing the common lodgers in the same way as the working population, 3057–3061. 3168–3176——Instance of excessive compensation awarded to owners for the demolition of their property, 3062, 3063. 3181–3183.

Large amount of good accomplished by voluntary efforts in Whitechapel in the purchase of property for improved dwellings; average of 4 per cent. paid upon the outlay upon these buildings, 3064–3073. 3113, 3114——Absence of restricted rules in the improved dwellings so long as the tenants are fairly decent livers; rents of these dwellings paid punctually as a rule, 3074–3080——Unsuitability of the Peabody Buildings for the class of people living in Whitechapel on account of the restrictive rules; objection in these buildings to permit women to take in washing, 3081–3087. 3217–3226.

Paper handed in by witness showing the particulars of the tenants in Lord Pembroke's dwellings, 3087–3096——Expediency of not pulling down the houses until the land is sold for building the new dwellings; great necessity for a power to demolish the houses gradually, 3097–3100. 3165–3167. 3188–3199——Hardship which would be entailed on certain of the poor in Whitechapel, by being obliged to reside in the suburbs; argument

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Barnett, The Rev. Samuel Augustus. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

argument that the poor should not be removed from the district, but should have better dwellings in the neighbourhood of their work, 3101–3105. 3119–3149.

Suggestions with a view to preventing the existing houses from becoming insanitary and getting into a filthy state; necessity of strict sanitary regulations for new houses, 3177–3180——Numerous districts in Whitechapel scheduled under the Artizans' Dwellings Act, 3200–3202——Interests which are chiefly affected in Whitechapel by the scheme for the new buildings; as the Legislature has permitted the present state of things to grow up, it ought to bear the cost, rather than the locality, 3203–3211——Benefit to the ratepayers from the improved dwellings, 3212–3215——Reference to a block of dilapidated buildings which is omitted from the improvements contemplated under the Act of 1875, on account of being surrounded by shops in the High-street, 3227–3230.

Barrack Buildings. Suggestion made by witness in 1870, when giving evidence before the Select Committee on Local Taxation, that barrack buildings at a small rent should be provided for working men below the artizans' class, where they should have the use of a common washouse and a common kitchen, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 256.

Further explanation in connection with the proposal that the Metropolitan Board should have considerable powers in the erection of barracks, for the accommodation not only of those displaced from condemned areas but of the poorer classes generally, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 496–502——Pressing want of receptacles better than the workhouse for the casual poor, where a bed can be had for 3 *d.* or 4 *d.*; belief that the ratepayers would save money thereby, *ib.* 500. 502.

Battersea Buildings. See *Victoria Dwellings Association (Limited).*

Bedfordbury. Completion and occupation of the new buildings in connection with the Bedfordbury scheme, *Goddard* 146; *Crouch* 166.

Statement showing for this scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

Statement showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Birmingham. Several appeals to a jury under the Birmingham scheme, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 213.

Particulars in connection with the award of Sir Henry Hunt, *App.* 197.

Birt, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Establishment by the Great Eastern Railway Company of a system of workmen's trains, which came into operation more than seven years ago, 1388–1391. 1535, 1536——Memorandum as to the obligations upon the company in respect of the running of workmen's trains, and as to the increased number of trains run in excess of the Parliamentary requirements; particulars hereon as to the trains from Edmonton, Enfield, Walthamstow, Stratford, Canning Town, and other places, and as to the fares charged, 1392–1409——Obligation to run a train daily from Edmonton and from Walthamstow to London at a fare of 2 *d.* for the return journey, 1393.

Conveyance of about 42,000 passengers weekly in the workmen's trains, the traffic being on the increase, 1410–1413. 1451, 1452. 1539–1548——Decided loss to the company in various ways in connection with the conveyance of workmen; great interference thereby with the ordinary passenger traffic, 1414–1425. 1476–1480. 1547. 1550, 1551——Demolition of houses for the metropolitan line of the company, in consideration of which they were put under the obligation as to workmen's trains, 1415–1418. 1458. 1484–1487.

Inconvenience and annoyance caused to ladies and others by the workmen passengers, the latter being, however, an honest and intelligent class, 1421–1425. 1500——Prejudicial effect of the erection of a large number of workmen's cottages in suburban localities in so far as the better class of railway passengers are thereby excluded, 1421. 1425. 1441–1446. 1507, 1508. 1550, 1551——Profit derived from certain trains, not under Parliamentary obligation, where the return fare is 3 *d.* or 4 *d.*; 1426——Use of workmen's trains by many of a higher class than that for which they were intended, 1427–1429. 1457.

Information as to the accommodation in the houses in the eastern suburbs where the workmen live; rent of about 7 *s.* a week, each cottage accommodating two families, there being three rooms for each family and one common room, 1430–1437. 1447–1450.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Birt, William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

1453, 1454——Little, if any, employment in the suburbs for the women and children, 1440—— Chief bulk of the traffic which goes to Liverpool-street; much larger traffic from Walthamstow than from Stamford Hill, 1455, 1456. 1465-1469. 1548.

Effect of the obligation to issue return tickets at a fare of 2 *d.* in causing the building of a large number of workmen's houses at places on the Great Eastern line; question hereon as to the effect of a similar obligation applied to other companies, 1459-1475. 1501-1524. 1545, 1546——Distance of 10¾ miles from Enfield to Liverpool-street, the return fare being only 2 *d.*; 1476-1478——Increased staff entailed by the early running of these trains, 1479, 1480.

Liberal interpretation by the Great Eastern Company of the obligation as to the running of workmen's trains; facilities given largely in excess of legal requirements, 1481-1489——Improbability of any curtailment of facilities, or any increase of fares, notwithstanding the unprofitable character of the traffic, 1482, 1483——Increased facilities contemplated if the legal return fare were 4 *d.* instead of 2 *d.*, and if the company might take the traffic to and from Bishopsgate Station instead of Liverpool-street, 1490, 1491. 1534.

Exceptional instances of the cottages in the suburbs having gardens of any size, 1495-1497. 1515, 1516——Failure of an attempt to issue third-class season tickets from Walthamstow, 1498, 1499—— Further particulars relative to the aggregation of cottages in the eastern suburbs; doubt as to the efficiency of the sanitary arrangements, 1507-1522.

Facility as regards workmen's cottages near Greenwich if there were a tunnel in communication with the Great Eastern system, 1525-1533——Occupation of about an hour-and-a-half by the double journey between Enfield and Liverpool-street, 1537, 1538——Apparent preference of workmen for residence in the suburbs, the number of such passengers on the Great Eastern line being constantly on the increase, 1539-1548.

Powers being sought by the company to acquire additional land for railway extension near London, 1552-1555——Equal increase, relatively, in the traffic where the return fare is 4 *d.* and in the traffic where the fare is only 2 *d.*; 1556, 1557——Information proposed to be supplied by witness as to the number of families displaced by the company in making their metropolitan line, and as to the localities to which they removed, 1558-1563.

Bowman's Buildings. See *Marylebone.*

Brooklyn. See *United States.*

Bryce, Mr. (*Member of the Committee*). Memorandum by Mr. Bryce containing information relative to the satisfactory and successful results of the efforts made by benevolent persons in the United States, notably in Boston and Brooklyn, to provide improved dwellings for the poor on a commercial basis, *App.* 237.

Building Acts. Respects in which further checks and increased inspection are required under the Metropolitan Building Acts; expediency of efficient supervision by the Metropolitan Board of all structural works, concurrently with an increased number of district surveyors, *Tripe* 1967-1974. 2000-2010.

Building Societies. Considerable number of inferior houses built by members of building societies, *Tripe* 1945-1949.

Desire upon the part of the working classes to become the owners of their own houses; disfavour in which the building societies are held by working men on account of the slowness of their operations, *Powell* 2524-2527——Numerous instances in which working men belong to building societies, *Abrey* 2616-2618; *Hodson* 2701-2703.

C.

Camberwell and Peckham. Large excess of accommodation provided as compared with the number to be accommodated in connection with the Camberwell and Peckham Improvement, *Goddard* 1610.

Inconvenience felt at Camberwell in respect of tramways and workmen's trains in getting to work in the mornings; objection on account of the impossibility of getting home to dinner, *Keating* 2036-2039. 2090-2097. 2170-2175——Statement that the district about Peckham and Camberwell has considerably deteriorated by the outflow from the centre of the town caused by the displacement of the inhabitants, *ib.* 2116-2119. 2176, 2177.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

City of London (Golden-lane and Petticoat-square):

1. *Explanations on the part of the City Commissioners of Sewers relative to the Action taken, or proposed to be taken, in respect of the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square Schemes; Difficulties in view of the Heavy Cost involved.*
2. *Dense Population in the Petticoat-lane District; Demand for Empty Rooms.*
3. *Prejudical effect of Clearances as regards the Local Tradespeople, and as regards many of those Displaced.*
4. *Unhealthness of the People in the more Crowded Localities.*
5. *Particulars relative to the Arbitration and Compensation in the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square Schemes.*
6. *Rateable Value of the City; Amount of Excepted Liability in respect of Expenditure of the Metropolitan Board for Artizans' Dwellings.*
7. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.*

1. *Explanations on the part of the City Commissioners of Sewers relative to the Action taken, or proposed to be taken, in respect to the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square Schemes; Difficulties in view of the Heavy Cost involved;*

Statement as to nothing having been done by the City Commissioners of Sewers since last Session under the Act of 1875 in the way of pulling down houses, the ground having already been cleared in the case of the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square sites, *Ashby* 1-7——Absence of any communiction between the City authorities and the Home Secretary since last Session upon the question of certain relaxations and facilities so as to lessen the expense of carrying out the intentions of the Act of 1875, *ib.* 9, 10.

Explanation more especially as to active steps not having been taken by the City Commissioners of Sewers since the Report of the Committee of last Session with regard to the relaxation of the conditions for letting the land on the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square sites, *Ashby* 11 *et seq.*——Intended application on the part of the City authorities to the Home Secretary in October last for permission to adopt certain relaxations; this was not proceeded with owing mainly to the Golden-lane area having been scheduled for railway purposes, *ib.* 12-14. 27——Postponement of action respecting thePetticoat-square area in the hope that the inquiry before the present Committee would facilitate modifications being obtained, *ib.* 13. 15-28.

Exceedingly heavy loss being incurred by the City in connection with the areas in question, the ground having been cleared at an immense cost, whilst there is great difficulty in letting the land though it has been frequently advertised, *Ashby* 16-45——Doubt as to there having been any irregularity in the clearance of the ground, *ib.* 18-20. 67, 68——Cost of more than 100,000 *l.* for the Golden-lane site; conditional offer of 410 *l.* a year recently received for this land, *ib.* 25. 33. 93.

Proposal now being put forward that the Court of Common Council shall negotiate with the Commissioners of Sewers with reference to the disposal of the land, *Ashby* 29——Clearance of the two areas in the City about two years ago, whereas it has not yet been found advisable to let either of the sites, *ib.* 30-45. 58——Summary of the proceedings of the Commissioners of Sewers respecting the areas in question since the Report of the Select Committee of 1881, *ib.* 33——Estimate of about 2 *s.* a foot as the commercial value of the land if freed from the conditions of the Act of 1875, *ib.* 38-42.

Importance attached to the relaxations recommended by the Select Committee of 1881, though hitherto the steps taken with a view to letting have not been successful, *Ashby* 43-45——Explanation as to the continued liability of the City through the Common Poor Fund of the metropolis in respect of the poor removed from the areas in question, *ib.* 46-57. 96-98.

Unsuccessful attempt to bring in some land at Holloway for artizans' dwellings, so as to utilise the cleared land for commercial purposes, *Ashby* 59-61. 82. 115-125——Full expectation of the Petticoat-square site being dealt with for reinstating the people displaced, *ib.* 62-65——Inability of the City to deal with the Golden-lane site, it having been scheduled for a railway, *ib.* 66.

Further examination as to the course pursued by the City authorities in not selling nor letting either of the cleared areas; that is, by reason of the utterly inadequate offers received, and in view of the approaching termination of the present inquiry, *Ashby* 69 *et seq.*——Increased difficulty of dealing with the Petticoat-square site by reason of the heavy tithe upon it under the City Tithe Act of last Session, *ib.* 75-82——Immense depreciation in the present value of any buildings erected on this site on account of the existing restrictions; grounds for this conclusion, *ib.* 79-82. 115-117. 123-125.

Great loss being incurred through the capital expended in clearing the land being entirely unproductive; justification nevertheless of the refusal of the City authorities to accept 3 *d.* a foot or to sell at twenty years' purchase on this basis, *Ashby* 89-95. 113, 114. 126-137——Reason assigned for not making application to the Secretary of State

Report, 1882—*continued.*

City of London (*Golden-lane and Petticoat-square*)—continued.

1. *Explanations on the part of the City Commissioners, &c.*—continued.

for a relaxation of restrictions as to the provision of shops, &c., so as to obtain more favourable offers, *Ashby* 102–114.

Witness is not prepared to say what loss the Commissioners of Sewers are prepared to incur in respect of the sites in question, *Ashby* 126-137——Probbable avoidance of any loss if the land might be let for commercial purposes, so as to produce 2 *s.* a foot, *ib.* 132–135.

Paper submitted by Mr. Ashby in explanation of a certain portion of his evidence respecting the rent and area in the case of Golden lane and Petticoat-square, *App.* 235.

2. *Dense Population in the Petticoat-lane District; Demand for Empty Rooms:*

Great demand for empty rooms in the Petticoat-lane district; system of tenant right in operation, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 233, 234——Very dense population and very large trade in this locality, *ib.* 234.

3. *Prejudicial effect of Clearances as regards the local Tradespeople, and as regards many of those Displaced:*

Very prejudicial effect of the improvements and clearances in the City upon business localities such as Petticoat-lane, *Gilbert* 1181——Loss of their means of living by many of those displaced by the Petticoat-lane improvements, *ib.* 1300, 1301.

4. *Unhealthiness of the People in the more Crowded Localities:*

Low class and unhealthy character of work people who come to Hackney from crowded localities in the City, *Tripe* 1994–1997.

5. *Particulars relative to the Arbitration and Compensation in the Golden Lane and Petticoat Square Schemes:*

Statment showing for the Golden-lane and Petticoat-square schemes the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

6. *Rateable Value of the City; Amount of Excepted Liability in respect of Expenditure of the Metropolitan Board for Artizans' Dwellings:*

Statement showing the rateable value of the metropolis and of the City; the sums charged for artizans' dwellings in annual precept by the Metropolitan Board upon the metropolitan area outside the City; and the amount the City would have had to contribute towards the Board's expenditure if not excepted by Act of Parliament, *App.* 232.

7. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee;*

Summary by the Committee of the operations of the Corporation of London in the clearance of areas, &c.; heavy cost incurred whilst the sites in question have remained practically undealt with for about three years, *Rep.* vi—— Reluctance of the Corporation to realise the great loss that would result from selling the cleared land subject to the condition of rebuilding labourers' dwellings, *ib.*——Large reduction within the last thirty or fourty years in the labouring population within the City boundaries, *ib.*

Exceptional value of land within the City, so that free scope should be given to the provisions of the Act of 1879 as to the accommodation being provided elsewhere, *Rep.* ix.

Opinion of the Committee that in the case of the Petticoat-square and Golden-lane sites it would not be wise to insist upon the reconstruction of artizans' dwellings at the heavy cost estimated for the whole of the population displaced, *Rep.* ix——Conclusion that the Corporation should be relieved of the obligation in respect of one-half of the number of persons for whom provision was to be made under the schemes, on condition of their promptly fulfilling their obligation as to the other half of the population displaced under the provisions of the Acts of 1875 and 1879, *ib.*

See also *Farringdon-road.*

Clapton Park. Wretched materials used in some houses built since 1879 in the lower parts of the Clapton Park estate; liability of these houses to be flooded, there being no power in the local or metropolitan authority to interfere, *Tripe* 1922–1929. 1936–1940.

Clerkenwell:

Progress made with the Pear Tree-court scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148——Advertisement of the Clerkenwell-road site for the first time in February 1879, an offer of 300 *l.* having been accepted in May 1880, and the buildings being now nearly completely, *ib.* 1570——Explanation as to the Clerkenwell-road improvement not having been commenced till 1879, the Act having been obtained in 1872, *ib.* 1624-1629.

Total

Report, 1882—*continued.*

CLERKENWELL—continued.

Total of 348 people displaced by the Clerkenwell-road improvement; considerable frontage taken in the case, *Goddard* 1640-1643——Obstacle under the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 to the provision of other sites in the same locality for the accommodation of those displaced by the foregoing improvement, *ib.* 1644——Satisfaction with which witness hears that improved workmen's buildings have been put up on an extensive scale in this locality through the liberal conduct of certain landlords, *ib.* 1645-1652.

Considerable overcrowding which has been caused in Clerkenwell by the demolition of houses in neighbouring parishes, *Rose* 2394. 2427-2429—— Great importance to the majority of the working men in Clerkenwell in being able to live in the neighbourhood of their work; certain class of workmen who could live outside as well as in the parish, *ib.* 2396–2402. 2407–2410. 2416-2418. 2431–2438. 2449–2459.

Considerable rise in rents in Clerkenwell within the last ten years; opinion that this is partly owing to the demolition of houses and partly to the increased population, *Rose* 2403. 2444-2448—— Demolition of houses for the purposes of the new street, *ib.* 2411–2414.

Believe that there would be no advantage on the score of health in the working men going to the suburbs, as Clerkenwell is quite as healthy as the suburban parishes, *Rose* 2419, 2420—— Instances of houses in Clerkenwell built originally to accommodate but one family in which there are now six or seven families living, *ib,* 2456.

Statement showing for the Clerkenwell scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

Paper showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

See also *Farringdon-road.*

Closing and Demolition of Insanitary Houses. Expediency of giving power to the Metropolitan Board and to the Commissioners of Sewers, but not to the arbitrators, to close very bad and insanitary houses; contemplated appeal in these cases, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 400–406.

Authority now obtained by the Board from the Home Secretary for the summary removal of unhealthy tenements in any of the schemes; belief that this permission was first given subsequently to the Report of the Select Committee of last Session, *Goddard* 567-571—— Benefit rather than hardship to the people themselves in breaking up their associations and style of living and in diffusing them among different localities, *ib.* 641–648. 657, 658.

Importance of clearing the sites and constructing the new buildings with the utmost rapidity, *Powell* 2491. 2497–2501——Expediency of the State having power to demolish houses unfit for habitation and to erect upon the sites suitable dwellings; suggestion that demolition should be carried out piecemeal so as to avoid as far as possible any injury to the inhabitants, *Hodson* 2671–2693. 2741-2744——Belief that very few of the working men of the better class with good wages would be affected by the demolition of bad insanitary houses, *ib.* 2691, 2692.

Expediency of not pulling down the houses until the land is sold for the erection of the new dwellings; great necessity for a power to demolish the houses gradually, *Barnett* 3087-3100. 3165–3167. 3188–3199.

Advantage of the proposed relaxation as to replacement of the people displaced, in so far as it will facilitate the pulling down of a certain number of houses in any area without the immediate removal of the whole, *Rep.* ix.

See also *Torrens' Acts.*

Commercial Purposes (*Utilisation of Sites*). See *Cost. Sites.*

Commissioners of Sewers. See *City of London.*

Common Lodging-Houses. Strong objection of the respectable labouring classes to go into common lodging-houses, *Gilbert* 1271–1276——Considerable difference between the people who occupy the nightly common lodging-houses and the decent working people who live in single rooms, *Barnett* 3016–3022.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

COMPENSATION:

1. *Total Compensation Awarded under Arbitration; Total agreed to in direct Settlement by the Metropolitan Board.*
2. *Limited Value allowed in respect of Tenements unfit for Habitation.*
3. *Practice as to Compensation for Trades.*
4. *Weekly Tenants.*
5. *Long Tenancies.*
6. *Question of Money Compensation to Tenants in lieu of the provision of New Dwellings.*
7. *Other Details and Suggestions generally.*
8. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee.*

1. *Total Compensation Awarded under Arbitration; Total agreed to in direct Settlement by the Metropolitan Board:*

List of awards made by witness, showing for each scheme the time occupied before the final award the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 185; *App.* 197—— Small difference between the aggregate of witness' provisional awards and the final awards, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 203, 204.

Total of 421,677 *l.* agreed to in settlement by the Board directly, the total by arbitration being 807,179 *l.*, *Goddard* 540.

2. *Limited Value allowed in respect of Tenements unfit for Habitation:*

Statement as to witness' practice in allowing only the value of the land and materials where the property is insanitary and thoroughly bad, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 226. 329-331. 336-347.

Expediency of allowing merely the value of the land and materials where the houses are so insanitary and dilapidated as to be past remedy; mode of arriving at the proper value in such cases, *Goddard* 512. 516-518. 575. 606, 607——Frequency of the sites upon which the worst class of buildings stands being more valuable than the tenements themselves; enhanced sum awarded for sites through the surrounding circumstances being an element in the valuation, *ib.* 548, 549.

Decided opinion that the owners of property which has been allowed to fall into a bad and insanitary state should not receive full compensation for surrender of the property; approval of giving in most cases only the value of the materials, *Miss Hill* 3372-3376.

3. *Practice as to Compensation for Trades:*

Explanation of the action of witness as arbitrator in allowing compensation for trades; legal opinions taken on this point, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 220-223——Explanation with further reference to the practice of witness in awarding compensation for loss of trade; question raised in Birmingham and Wolverhampton as to there being any claim on this score, *ib.* 348-353——Dissent from Mr. Rodwell's practice in not giving any compensation in respect of small trades, *ib.* 392, 393.

Further consideration of the amounts awarded by witness as compensation for loss of trade, on the ground that it was only just to give such compensation, though a legal opinion was obtained to the effect that it was not prescribed by the Act; doubt as to the enhanced expense thus incurred, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 463-475——Probable reduction of trade compensation if the Metropolitan Board were empowered to build some houses on part of the condemned area, which might be offered to the people engaged in trade, *ib.* 476-479——Various circumstances taken into consideration in assessing the compensation to be awarded in respect of trade or business; no reliance is ever placed on income tax receipts, *ib.* 487-492.

Provision in the Act under which no allowance is to be made for trade compensation, *Goddard* 512——Great difficulty in dealing with claims for trade compensation in the smaller class of cases, *ib.* 546——Expediency of trade compensation in the case of a person who loses his business through compulsory purchase of premises, *Rayner* 3473, 3474.

4. *Weekly Tenants:*

Explanation as to the course pursued by witness in dealing with weekly tenants; conclusion as to the fair claim of these to compensation, especially where the occupation has extended over many years, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 233, 234. 389-396—— Practice of witness to invariably give compensation to weekly tenants in respect of property taken for railway companies; large sum also given to this class in respect of the property taken for the Courts of Justice, *ib.* 234-237.

Probability of witness having given a higher compensation to weekly tenants than Mr. Rodwell gave, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 333——Opinion that the same principle should be observed under the Amendment Act of 1879 as under the original Act in the compensation of weekly tenants, *ib.* 334.

Doubt

COMPENSATION—continued.

4 *Weekly Tenants*—continued.

Doubt as to there being any legal authority under the Act for the award of compensation to weekly tenants, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 360, 361——Decided disapproval of Mr. Rodwell's suggestion that a small uniform sum should be given to weekly tenants irrespectively of the period of their tenancy, *ib.* 394-396.

5. *Long Tenancies:*

Explanation as regards compensation for length of tenancy that 15 *l.* is the maximum awarded, it resting with the local authorities to carry out the award or to oppose it, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 233. 354-359. 389-391.

6. *Question of Money Compensation to Tenants in lieu of the provision of New Dwellings:*

Suggestion that the best mode of dealing with the people displaced by the clearance of any area is to give them a small money compensation, leaving them to find accommodation elsewhere, which they can readily do, there being plenty of empty houses, *Reid* 804. 816-821. 857. 880-889. 898. 904, 905 ——Recommendation that those whose dwellings have been cleared away should be compensated, it being left to them to suit themselves elsewhere, *Walker* 963, 964. 1140, 1141——Approval of some of those displaced receiving a small money compensation and being allowed to select their place of residence elsewhere, *Goddard* 1711-1716.

Ruin to many of the lower classes by pulling down their houses and giving them a small compensation, without providing new homes for them near their work, *Gilbert* 1189 ——Concurrence in the view that it is highly objectionable to give small money compensation to the people displaced, without any provision for their being accommodated in the neighbourhood of their work, *Field* 2295-2297. 2310, 2311. 2329-2331. 2385-2388; *Abrey* 2615; *Hodson* 2695; *Miss Stanley* 2869——Inexpediency of giving money compensation to the tenant a long time before they leave, *Barnett* 3055, 3056.

7. *Other Details and Suggestions generally:*

Suggestion whether in any revision of the Act of 1875 a local authority taking proceedings under it should not be bound with as much dispatch as possible to compensate everybody who has an interest, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 223——Rejection of agreements by witness whenever he had reason to believe they were manufactured for the sake of compensation, *ib*, 335.

Numerous cases now settled between the claimants and the Metropolitan Board, without coming before the arbitrator or going to a jury; check by means of costs, if unreasonable claims are afterwards taken before the arbitrator, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 411-417. 446-453——Objection to the arbitrator being informed what the Board were prepared to give, *ib.* 411, 412. 414. 418, 419.

Belief that if witness' awards had been made under the Act of 1879 instead of the earlier Act, the amounts would have been much the same as those which he has given, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 480-482——Several matters taken into account by witness in estimating the value of reversioners' property, *ib.* 483-486——Suggested discretion in the jury or in the arbitrator as to the allowance of ten per cent.; undue stringency of the Act on this point, *ib.* 502-504.

Basis of witness' valuation in cases where by a certain expenditure the houses can be made sanitary and habitable, *Goddard* 512. 516. 520-524——Improved practice as to compensation under the Act of 1875; abandonment of the former system of allowing twenty years for freeholds, and sixteen years for leaseholds, however good or bad the property, *ib.* 513-516——Excessive valuation put upon property by witnesses before the arbitrators; unreliable evidence frequently given on oath before juries, *ib.* 528. 530.

Grounds for the opinion that no interest either of lease or agreement for lease should be considered valid if made after the provisional order had been announced; great number of "bogus" interests now put forward, *Goddard* 583. 639. 648, 649——Way in which the amount of compensation is arrived at in the case of isolated plots of land in the middle of a scheme, with houses all round, *ib.* 595-597.

Concurrence in the suggestion that after a certain point has been reached in each scheme, compensation claims should not be allowed for any improvement except made by compulsion or for sanitary purposes, *Goddard* 650, 651 ——Explanation of the manner in which compensation cases are arranged by the Board of Works, *ib.* 3665.

Proposal as regards compensation, that the property to be taken be classified into three divisions, *Reid* 890.

Suggestions in regard to improvements in the existing Act with reference to assessing compensation for compulsory sites; improvement in the practice of assessment of the compensation, as at Liverpool, *Rayner* 3503-3515. 3554-3566. 3615, 3616——Belief that if the machinery under the Act were applied as suggested by witness, the compensation to be paid would be reduced by more than twenty-five per cent., *ib.* 3508.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Compensation—continued.

8. *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee:*

Clear intention of the Acts of 1875 and 1879 to guard against any excessive valuation of the property, *Rep.* vi, vii——Difficulty under Section 3 of the Act of 1875 as regards the principle of valuation of the property taken; recommendation that the words in question be left out by future legislation, *ib.* vii.

Concurrence in the principle of limiting the compensation to the value of the land and materials where the houses are so bad and dilapidated as to be unfit for habitation, *Rep.* vii.

Expediency of compensation for trade profit being carefully limited, and of reference being had to the opportunities of re-commencement of trade in the immediate neighbourhood, *Rep.* vii.

Consideration by the Committee of the different practice of Sir Henry Hunt and Mr. Rodwell in dealing with weekly tenants; preference for the practice adopted by the latter, each case being dealt with on its own merits, *Rep.* vii.

Comparatively small amount of the whole compensation awarded to weekly tenants, *Rep.* vii.

Decided opinion that no money payment should be made till actual removal takes place, *Rep.* viii.

Recommendation by the Committee as to the period to be fixed after which no person should be entitled to recover or claim compensation for any alteration in term or tenure, or for any improvements in the property, unless made compulsorily for sanitary purposes, *Rep.* viii. xiii.

See also *Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879. *Appeals. Arbitration. City of London. Cost. Law Courts. Liverpool. Market Value. Notice to Treat. Public-houses. School Board. Sites. Sun-street to Worship-street Improvement. Whitechapel and Limehouse.*

Conditions of Sale or Lease. Decision arrived at by the Metropolitan Board since last Session that future sites shall be sold, under revised conditions as to the erection of artizans' dwellings, instead of being let on lease, *Goddard* 141. 144, 145——Importance of the revised condition whereby purchasers are to be bound only for a term of ten years in the erection of artizans' dwellings; approval by the Home Secretary of this relaxation in respect of several sites, *ib.* 141. 144, 145. 152, 153. 159-162.

Effect of the present restrictions in deterring offers for the cleared areas, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 308——Examination as to the probable operation of the relaxation whereby the buildings are to be maintained as artizans' dwellings for only ten years instead of eighty years; question more especially as to the facilities and cost of conversion of the buildings into warehouses or shops, *ib.* 309–326.

Stringent conditions in the letting of the land, so as to insure the sites being used for the specified purposes, *Goddard* 555, 556——Expediency of the condition as to the superintending architect of the Board being sole arbitrator, *ib.* 555——Regulation of the price by the conditions and by the requirement as to the replacement of the population on the same area, *ib.* 556.

Approval of the conditions and restrictions under which the land has been sold to the Peabody Trustees, *Reid* 809, 810——Question considered as to the conditions of sale first imposed by the Metropolitan Board having been fair and reasonable, as well as the altered conditions applied in the case of the Peabody Trustees, *ib.* 858-873——Practice generally in the case of large building estates to put the lessees into the hands of the surveyor to the estate, *Walker* 974.

Conditions of sale of land by the Metropolitan Board, as regards approval of plans for buildings, &c., *App.* 202, 203.

Paper handed in by Mr. Goddard showing the amended conditions of sale of artizans' plots as finally approved by the Home Secretary, *App.* 224-226.

See also *City of London. Gray's Inn-road.*

Consolidation of Acts. Reference by the Committee to the necessity of consolidating the whole of the existing Acts, *Rep.* xiii.

Conversion of Buildings. Improbability of its paying to convert to other purposes at the end of ten years houses built expressly for workmen, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 362–366——Great expense in the removal or conversion of artizans' buildings after ten years, *Reid* 811-813.

Cost (*Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879):

Heavy cost and unavoidable loss to the ratepayers in the clearance of unhealthy areas, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 192——Proposition for a simplified procedure in the settlement of schemes, &c., the result being that the cost under the Acts would be greatly reduced, *ib.* 192 *et seq.*

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Cost (*Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879)—continued.

Avoidance of great loss to the ratepayers if the Whitechapel and similar properties could have been dealt with commercially, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 227——Less difficulty doubtless in carrying out the Acts if the cost of acquiring sites were lessened, and if the payments received for the sites were increased, *ib.* 266–270.

Reference to the class and number of cases to be dealt with by a jury under witness' scheme as adding somewhat to the expense of working the Act; large saving of expense on the other hand by doing away with appeals, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 454–462——Conclusion that, on the whole, expenses would be saved under witness' scheme, *ib.* 459.

Particulars with reference to the original estimate for each scheme, the actual cost, the recoupment and the loss; table on the subject handed in to the Committee, *Goddard* 532–540; *App.* 199.

Further table submitted showing the total area taken under each scheme, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *Goddard* 541; *App.* 200.

Increased value of the cleared areas, and reduced cost to the Metropolitan Board, if the land could be sold for commercial purposes, *Goddard* 550–554; *Reid* 801, 802. 900–905; *Walker* 959–962. 1085, 1086. 1107–1109——Average loss by the Board of two-thirds of the total cost of the land, *Goddard* 652, 653——Probable loss of not more than fifteen per cent. if the land could be sold for commercial purposes, *ib.* 654–656.

Correction of preceding statement as to the loss being only fifteen per cent. if the sites were sold for commercial purposes, *Goddard* 671–673——Explanation that the average loss on all the schemes under the Artizans' Act is eighty-two per cent., whilst the average loss on street improvement is seventy-five per cent., *ib.* 674–680.

Basis of witness' calculation of the per-centages of the different improvements; necessity of making large allowance for street approaches, &c., in reduction of the area for sale, *Goddard* 722–729.

Necessity of very heavy cost being incurred by the Metropolitan Board in the clearance of densely covered sites under the Acts, *Reid* 797; *Walker* 957——Wide range of cost of the six sites purchased by the Peabody Trustees, *Reid* 797——Enhanced outlay involved where it is necessary to acquire sanitary property in order to complete the schemes, *Reid* 798–800; *Walker* 958——Exorbitant price which the Board must pay for sites in the centre of London, in the absence of compulsory powers, *Walker* 1087–1094.

Paper submitted by Mr. Grant containing a comparison of outlay in respect of each scheme, and of estimated return, *App.* 204.

Gross and net accounts of the receipts and disbursements of the Metropolitan Board in respect of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts in each year since 1875, *App.* 233.

Summary by the Committee of the original cost in respect of the areas dealt with, the recoupment, and the loss incurred, *Rep.* v——Conclusion that the difficulty in carrying out the Acts obviously arises from the great cost involved, *ib.* vi.

Conclusions and suggestions of the Committee upon the three chief sources of cost; namely, the amount of compensation given, the expense of procedure (including law charges), and the obligation to sell or relet for rebuilding artizans' dwellings, *Rep.* vi–x.

Saving of expense by dispensing with the provisional award, *Rep.* viii——Important reduction of cost anticipated from a relaxation of the requirement as to the replacement of the total number displaced, *ib.* ix.

See also *Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879. *Appeals. Arbitration. City of London. Compensation. Conditions of Sale or Lease. Displacement and Replacement of Population. Gray's Inn Road. Market Value. Peabody Trust. Rates and Ratepayers. Sites. State Aid. Whitechapel and Limehouse.*

Costermongers. Impracticability under the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 of replacing the costermonger class in artizans' dwellings, *Gibbon* 1820——Large number of costermongers resident in Hackney; different markets whence they obtain supplies, *Tripé* 1977–1982.

Unsuitability of the Peabody Buildings for tenants of the costermonger class; impossibility for costermongers to live in the suburbs on account of being far from their business, *Keating* 2054–2065 2069. 2072–2078. 2083–2086——Difficulties in accommodating costermongers in the Peabody Buildings on account of the want of a sufficient water supply; absolute necessity of having buildings in the centre of the town specially for these people, *ib.* 2055, 2056. 2064, 2065. 2069. 2099–2102.

Entire want of accommodation for costermongers in the new buildings, in the way of standing room for their trucks, or store rooms for their goods, *Miss Stanley* 2853.

Special accommodation contemplated in some cases for costermongers and others, *Rep.* x.

Costs. Particulars relative to the course pursued by witness in the taxation of costs; disallowance under different circumstances, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 238–244——Adoption of

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Costs—continued.

Ryde's scale as regards the fees or costs of surveyors; recognition of this scale by the Court of Chancery, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 238–240.

Letter from witness' solicitor, Mr. Winkworth as to the principles to be carried out by witness in the taxation of costs, and as to the difference of practice between him and Mr. Rodwell, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 240, 241.

Further particulars as to the practice generally of witness in respect of costs; dissent from certain evidence of Mr. Rodwell on the subject, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 420–448—— Extensive discretion exercised by witness under the Act in the disallowance of costs to owners, *ib* 420-423.

Several matters allowed by witness as fairly coming under charge for costs, such as the preparation of claims; due care taken in the disallowance of improper charges, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 429-439——Allowance of Ryde's scale in nearly all cases where witness has considered a surveyor to be necessary, *ib.* 440-445.

Opinion that the costs should go against the claimant whenever he is awarded less by the arbitrator than has been offered by the local authority, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 439–453.

Suggestion by the Committee that the twenty-ninth paragraph of the Schedule to the Act of 1875 should be amended so as to make it quite clear that the arbitrator has the power to refuse to give costs, if he thinks the case one in which no costs should be given, *Rep.* viii.

Crouch, John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—As Secretary to the Peabody Trustees, witness explains the progress made since last Midsummer with the various blocks of buildings, and with the schemes not yet commenced upon, 164–169—— The sanction of the Secretary of State has been applied for with a view to modifications of the Whitecross-street and Pear Tree-court schemes; otherwise there has been no delay, and it is expected that the whole of the areas will be covered with buildings by Midsummer, 1883; 166-172.

Crown-place (Soho). See *Soho.*

D

Damp-proof Courses. Further check suggested as regards the damp-proof courses of new houses; duty of the district surveyor in this respect, *Tripe* 1968. 2002–2004.

Delay. Unavoidable delay sometimes under the conditions of sale in pulling down the old houses and in the removal of the materials, *Goddard* 142, 143.

See also *City of London.* *Gray's Inn-road.* *Western Improvements Scheme.*

Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses. Limited extent to which witness found there had been sales of the worst class of houses, as affording any criterion of their value, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 384-387—— Ownership of bad property chiefly by small tradesmen, *Goddard* 525—— Necessity of the Metropolitan Board often paying more than the market value for insanitary property, *ib.* 526, 527.

Several insanitary areas yet requiring to be dealt with, *Walker* 1148——Great importance of the gradual removal of slums, proper provision being made at the same time for the re-housing of those who are displaced, *Gilbert* 1192—— Sanitary improvement by pulling down old and crowded habitations in different localities, but with much detriment to those dislodged, *ib.* 1262, 1263.

Wretched sanitary condition of some houses inspected by witness between Rupert-street and Macclesfield-street, *Goddard* 1581—— Numerous places in the metropolis still to be dealt with under the Acts of 1875 and 1879; more rapid progress if the local authorities were more free to take action, *Gibbon* 1844, 1845.

Obstacle to any interference with the occupation of defective or insanitary houses when first built; check now exercised through the local authorities as regards drainage, &c., *Tripe* 1956–1966. 1972—— Existence of areas which should long ago have been cleared as being dangerous to those dwelling in them and to those around, *Powell* 2491. 2542–2548.

Rapid decay of houses in which the lowest class of the poor live, if left without repair, in a densely crowded district; the process first of repair and then of re-building should be always going on, *Miss Hill* 3274–3280.

See also *City of London.* *Closing and Demolition of Insanitary Houses.* *Compensation.* *Market Value.* *Owners.* *Re-building.* *Rents.* *Sanitary Arrangements.* *Soho.* *Torrens' Acts.* *Western Improvements Scheme.*

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Displacement and Replacement of Population:

1. *Operation of the Act of* 1875, *and of the Acts of* 1872 *and* 1877, *as regards the Local Accommodation, or the Dispersion, of the People Displaced by the Clearance of any Area.*
2. *Extent to which it is Important that those Displaced should be Re-housed in some Locality, or in the Immediate Vicinity of their Work.*
3. *Question of Replacing the Entire Number Displaced; Expediency of Relaxation of the Restrictions on this Point.*
4. *Conclusions of the Committee; Relaxations Recommended.*

1. *Operation of the Act of* 1875, *and of the Acts of* 1872 *and* 1877, *as regards the Local Accommodation, or the Dispersion, of the People Displaced by the Clearance of any Area:*

Better class of tenements to which the displaced people have removed, though they have not gone into the Peabody Buildings, *Goddard* 704–707——Advantage of displacement if it tends to disperse associations of thieves or prostitutes, *ib.* 708–712——Total of 22,000 people disturbed by the schemes hitherto, provision being made for 2,209 in excess of this number, *ib.* 718, 719.

Bad social effect of driving the poorer classes out of their homes; great impetus thereby to democracy and republicanism, *Gilbert* 1189. 1197, 1198. 1277. 1301–1303——Difficulty in tracing the subsequent movements of the people whose houses have been pulled down; great hardship in numerous instances when they have been compelled to live at a considerable distance from their work, *ib.* 1300–1317. 1327, 1328——Strong and better feeling among the people themselves as to the injuries inflicted upon them when deprived of their houses by sanitary or building improvements, *ib.* 1315. 1317.

Total of 1,547 persons displaced by different improvements, whom the Metropolitan Board were obliged to re-house under the provisions of the Street Improvements Act of 1872, *Goddard* 1565——Erection of buildings upon seven out of the nine sites acquired by the Board, *ib.* 1571, 1572——Total of 10,129 persons to be re-housed under the provisions of the Act of 1877; different improvements in respect of which this number is made up, *ib.* 1580, 1581——Different ways in which those displaced may be accommodated; migratory character of the people, *ib.* 1601–1608. 1707. 1711–1716.

Difficulty in showing before any large number of dilapidated houses are pulled down, that accommodation is available within a certain radius for those displaced, *Gibbon* 1824–1826.

2. *Extent to which it is Important that those Displaced should be Re-housed in the same Locality, or in the Immediate Vicinity of their Work:*

Exceptional instances of the people displaced by schemes under the Acts of 1875 and 1879 returning to the same locality, *Goddard* 657, 658——Expediency of many of the people displaced by the removal of slums being re-housed in the same vicinity in order to be near their work; advantage on the other hand in large numbers removing to the suburbs to more comfortable lodgings, *Reid* 852–857. 874–882——Necessity where there are displacements on a large scale of providing accommodation in the locality for a portion of those displaced; average of about two-fifths locally employed, *Walker* 1073–1077. 1110–1115.

Facility and priority to be given to those who are removed, as regards rooms in new buildings, *Gilbert* 1192. 1365——Hardship in people being removed to such a distance as to be obliged to walk several miles to and from their work, *Gibbon* 1827–1830.

Great advantage in living close to the place of work; illustration in witness' case, *Keating* 2033–2040. 2131–2133. 2137–2142——Expediency of providing for the accommodation of the people before they are displaced by the demolition of the old houses, *Kirkham* 2216–2223.

Strong opinion that suitable dwellings should be erected to accommodate the working classes when turned out of the houses about to be pulled down; non-objection to the people being moved if they are provided with houses elsewhere, *Field* 2274, 2275. 2288–2290. 2329, 2330. 2379–2384——Occupation of the new buildings almost entirely by strangers to the neighbourhood; expediency of permitting the people who have been turned out to have the first privilege of occupying the newly-built houses, *ib.* 2288. 2294. 2351–2363——Desirability of provision being made gradually, bit by bit, for the accommodation of the working men when a district is pulled down; entire ruin of an important industry when a large population living by each other is broken up and displaced, *ib.* 2339–2350. 2364–2366.

Decided opinion that local accommodation should be provided for artizans and labourers who are displaced by the demolition of their houses, *Powell* 2472——In the case of persons who have been dispossessed and who are employed at a distance, it would not be necessary to provide house accommodation for them, as they could be provided for in the suburbs, *Abrey* 2601–2604——Strong opinion that eight or ten-roomed houses should be provided for the working classes when any of the demolitions take place, *Evans* 2751. 2767–2772. 2790. 2820.

Report, 1882 —*continued.*

Displacement and Replacement of Population—continued.

2. *Extent to which it is Important that those Displaced, &c.*—continued.

Decided opinion that the working people should be re-housed in the same neighbourhood on account of their work; large expense which going to the suburbs entails upon the working man, *Miss Stanley* 2841–2847. 2860–2865. 2869–2877. 2903–2906. 2927–2931——Large number of workmen employed in certain trades which make it necessary that they should live near their work, *ib.* 2844–2846..2960–2962.

Necessity for reconstruction in the same neighbourhood as that in which the demolition takes place; provision need not be made for re-housing the common lodgers in the same way as the working population, *Barnett* 3057–3061. 3166–3176——Hardship which would be entailed on certain of the poor in Whitechapel, by being obliged to reside in the suburbs; argument that the poor should not be removed from the district but should have better dwellings in the neighbourhood of their work, *ib.* 3101–3105. 3119–3149.

Decided opinion that the population which has been displaced should be re-housed as far as possible in the same neighbourhood; large number of trades which necessitate the people living near their work, *Miss Hill* 3244–3258. 3261. 3281–3284.—— The population that could be removed without very serious loss or discomfort would vary very much according to the district and to the work done in the district, *ib.* 3324–3326 ——Inexpediency of removing the lowest class of people from any neighbourhood to other districts; disinclination of these persons to live with others of a higher class than themselves, *ib.* 3377–3387.

3. *Question of Replacing the Entire Number Displaced; Expediency of Relaxation of the Restrictions on this Point:*

Approval of its being left to the confirming authority, subject to the Secretary of State, to inquire into and decide in each case how far it is necessary to provide accommodation for the people displaced, *Goddard* 713–717—— Inexpediency of extensive displacement without any obligation under the Act to make new provision; discretion to be exercised by the Home Secretary, *ib.* 720, 721.

Waste of public money by the existing restrictions in the metropolis, whilst there would be no hardship whatever in the gradual removal of slums without the present conditions as to replacement of the population, there being an ample supply of available accommodation, *Grant* 736–738. 759–762. 779–785.

Memorandum by Mr. Grant explanatory of his views in detail as to the operation of the Acts of 1875 and 1879; total disapproval of the policy embodied in the Acts, and of the restrictions as to replacement, *App.* 205–207.

Result of witness' experience that the Artizans' Dwellings Acts can only be carried out at great expense to the ratepayers, and that the people displaced by the removal of slums might be left to provide for themselves, a few pounds being given in each case on removal, *Reid* 804. 816–821. 857. 880–889. 898. 904, 905——Proposed adoption of a clause similar to that in the Metropolitan District Railway Act of 1881, enabling the Metropolitan Board to make agreements with people about to be displaced, instead of providing accommodation for them elsewhere, *ib.* 898, 899. 910–913. 935–948.

Difficulty in providing for the number displaced, on accounts of the small houses being packed so close, *Walker* 967——Expediency of the Act of 1875 being modified by requiring that the accommodation to be provided locally should apply to only two-fifths of those displaced, *ib.* 1113–1115. 1174–1178.

Opinion that the Board should have full power to use the ground when cleared for any purpose; the people displaced can obtain accommodation within a reasonable distance without much difficulty, *Goddard* 1620, 1621. 1653. 1711–1716——Approval generally of a system whereby some of the people displaced by the clearance of slums should be re-housed in the same locality or district, whilst others should receive small money compensations and be allowed to select their place of residence, *ib.* 1711–1716.

Opinion that artizans' dwellings should be erected in all parts of the metropolis for the accommodation of a portion of the people displaced by improvement schemes, *Gibbon* 1765–1770.

Decided objection to any extensive modification of the requirement that where people are displaced by schemes under the Artizans' Dwellings Act the same amount of accommodation must be provided for them in the same neighbourhood; insufficiency of providing for only two-fifths of those displaced, *Gilbert* 1183–1188.

4. *Conclusions of the Committee; Relaxations Recommended:*

Satisfaction expressed by the Committee with the result of the suggestions made in their interim Report of last Session for enlarging the discretion of the confirming authority, *Rep.* iii——Conclusion that many of the areas reported as unhealthy under the Act of 1875 should be removed, and that some provision should be made for rebuilding dwellings for a certain portion of the working classes who may be so displaced, *ib.*

Grounds

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Displacement and Replacement of Population—continued.

4. *Conclusions of the Committee; Relaxations Recommended*—continued.

Grounds upon which the Committee recommend that the Act of 1875 be amended, so as to relieve provincial towns of the obligation as to replacement of the population displaced, *Rep.* viii, ix.

Great hardship in the metropolis if the provisions for replacement on or near the area of displacement were wholly done away with, *Rep.* ix—— Considerable number of persons for whom it is not essential to provide in or near the area of displacement, *ib.*

Conclusion that the provision should be relaxed which requires that the improvement scheme shall provide for the accommodation of at the least as many persons of the working classes as may be displaced, *Rep.* ix. xiii——Recommendation that the accommodation to be required should vary from one-half to two-thirds, as the confirming authority may think fit, on the report of the person holding the local inquiry, *ib.*——Suggestions with a view to the speedy provision of new accommodation, *ib.* x.

Recommended alteration of the Standing Order, No. 184, sufficient safeguards being still retained in the interests of the persons to be displaced, *Rep.* xiii.

See also *City of London. Clerkenwell. Closing and Demolition of Insanitary Houses. Compensation. Condition of Sale or Lease. Cost. Empty Houses. Glasgow. Gray's Inn-road. Law Courts. Markets. Metropolitan-street Improvements Acts. Newport Market. Occupations of Tenants. Over-crowding. Peabody Trust. Private Enterprise. Sites. Southwark and Great Dover-street Scheme. Suburbs. Sun-street to Worship-street Improvement. Western Improvements Scheme. Whitechapel and Limehouse,* 4. *Women and Children. Workmen's Trains.*

Dock Labourers. Importance of accommodation for dock labourers close to their work, *Gilbert* 1183——Great fluctuation in the weekly earnings of dock labourers; doubt as to the average earnings being 12 *s.* a week, *ib.* 1325, 1326.

Drury Lane Improvement. See *Great Wild-street.*

E.

Emigration. Instances of the emigration of small shopkeepers and others displaced by improvements; hardship when this course is forced upon people strongly opposed to it, *Gilbert* 1302, 1303. 1321, 1322.

Employers. Importance attached by employers to local residences for their workpeople, *Gibbon* 1878–1880.

Employment. Considerable number of the labouring classes unemployed at different periods of the year; question hereon as to the hardship in these being transported, through the removal of "slums," to places where employment is plentiful, *Gilbert* 1318–1326——Great dearth of employment in London at the present time among the unskilled class of labourers, *Powell* 2530–2535

Empty Houses. Reports by the engineer and architect of the Metropolitan Board as to the vacant accommodation available for artizans displaced, and as to the facilities of transit, *Goddard* 141. 149. 163——Large amount of information obtained from the local or district authorities as to the number of vacant cottages available for artizans, *ib.* 141. 149, 150.

Statement as to the excess of empty houses available in London for all the population displaced by the various improvement schemes of the Metropolitan Board, the restrictions under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts being unnecessary and injurious, *Grant* 736–738. 759–762. 779–785——Information relative to the number of inhabited and uninhabited houses, respectively, the total population, and the proportion of persons per house in 1871 and in 1881; conclusion as to it not being necessary for the Metropolitan Board to provide for artizans' buildings on the cleared areas, *ib.* 779–785.

Considerable number of empty houses in Peckham, Wandsworth, and other localities, *Walker* 963. 1020–1022——Fairness in the authorities carrying out dispossession if they should find that there were sufficient vacant houses within a reasonable distance, *Hodson* 2738–2740.

Absence, in witness' experience, of any empty houses in London at the present time in which artizans could live, *Miss Stanley* 2854——Large number of empty houses in the suburbs into which artizans will not go on account of the expense, *ib.* 2855, 2856.

Enfield (*Great Eastern Railway*). Distance of 10¾ miles from Enfield to Liverpool-street, the return fare being only 2 *d.*, *Birt* 1476–1478——Occupation of about an hour and-a-half by the double journey between Enfield and Liverpool-street, *ib.* 1537, 1538.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Essex-road Scheme. See *Islington.*

Evans, W. Alfred. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a house painter and grainer living at Barelay-court, Clerkenwell; is employed by the sub-contractor to Mowlem & Sons, 2745-2748. 2773-2776.

Objection to the model dwellings on account of their barrack-like appearance, with outside staircases; it is only as a last resource that these dwellings are inhabited, in consequence of people with families being unable to get houses elsewhere, 2749, 2750. 2791-2794. 2804-2806——Strong opinion that eight or ten-roomed houses should be provided for the working classes when any of the demolitions take place, 2751. 2767-2772. 2790. 2820——Inconvenience caused to the working man by being obliged to live in the suburbs; numerous instances of working men returning to town on account of the overcrowding and other drawbacks, 2752-2755. 2757-2766. 2799-2801. 2826-2832.

Complaints in regard to the difficulty of getting to and from the suburbs by workmen's trains; temptation to working men to spend their money in public-houses while waiting for trains, 2756-2759. 2766. 2777-2789. 2799-2801. 2817-2819——Injurious effect of driving the people to the suburbs and making them dependent on friendly and saving societies; belief that it increases pauperism and destroys the habits of thrift which the men would indulge in if they had comfortable homes in London, 2760. 2802, 2803. 2815, 2816.

Objection to the model dwellings on account of the absence of playgrounds for children; great danger to children in going up and down the staircases of these buildings, 2791-2794. 2804-2814——Disapproval of permitting large warehouses to be built in London whilst the working classes are driven out of the town by the demolition of their houses, 2795-2798——Admission that if working men are of a saving disposition they can save in the country as well as in town, 2815, 2816——Insanitary state of many of the houses in which the better class artizans live in London; explanation that this is often owing more to the landlord's neglect than to the bad state of the house itself, 2820-2825——Statement that in the suburbs the general condition of the houses are not better than in London, 2826, 2827——Belief that the difficulty of procuring provisions in the country is an evil very generally felt, 2828-2834.

F.

Farringdon-road. Exeellent block of buildings erected by the Corporation in Farringdon-road, the land having been bought from the Clerkenwell Improvement Trustees, and a return of four per cent. being derived; reason for not following this precedent in respect of the Golden-lane or Petticoat-square sites, *Ashby* 73, 74. 83-90.

Field, John. (Analysis of his Evidenee.)—Is a painter and house decorator, living at 45, Old Compton-street; has a family of three children, one of whom is employed in the neighbourhood, 2263-2272.

Strong opinion that suitable dwellings should be erected to accommodate the working classes when they are turned out of the houses about to be pulled down; non-objeetion to the people being moved if they are provided with houses elsewhere, 2274, 2275. 2288-2290. 2329, 2330. 2379-2384——Belief that to remove to the suburbs would be highly inconvenient to most working men; reasons for this opinion, 2276, 2277. 2326-2328.

Low class of labourers who inhabit Crown-street; superior class of artizans in Old Compton-street, 2278-2285——Overcrowding which has taken place in the neighbourhood by reason of the demolition in Bedfordbury and Wild-street, 2286, 2287——Statement that the new buildings are inhabited almost entirely by strangers to the neighbourhood; expedieney of permitting the people who have been turned out to have the first privilege of occupying the newly-built houses, 2283. 2294. 2351-2363——Increase of rents in Chapel-place and Crown-street on account of the overcrowding, 2287——Insanitary state of Crown-place at the present time; entire absence of inspeetion by the medical offieer of the district, 2287. 2317-2325. 2382, 2383.

Strong objection to the Peabody and the Waterlow Buildings on account of the unnecessary restrictions upon the tenants; opinion that a respeetable reference is all that should be required from a tenant seeking accommodation, 2291-2294. 2301-2305. 2360, 2361. 2369-2374——Compensation given to the persons who were turned out of Wild-street and Bloomsbury; disapproval of the system of compensating the people by money payments instead of providing them with better and cleaner dwellings, 2295-2297. 2310, 2311. 2329-2331. 2385-2388.

Neeessity for the erection of houses suitable for a poorer class than inhabit the existing Peabody Buildings, 2301. 2305. 2307. 2360——Importance for witness to live in the quarter he is in at the present time on account of the eharacter of his labour, 2313-2316——Impossibility of keeping a home and family together if working men are obliged to live

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Field, John. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

live in the suburbs and come to their work in London, 2331–2338——Desirability of provision being made generally, bit by bit, for the accommodation of the working men when a district is pulled down; entire ruin of an important industry when a large population living by each other is broken up and displaced, 2339–2350. 2364–2366.

Flight, Thomas (*the late*). Utterly deplorable condition of the large amount of poor property held by the late Thomas Flight, *Goddard* 517.

G.

Gibbon, Dr. Septimus. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness has been medical officer of the Holborn District since 1856, and is intimately acquainted with the property taken under the Gray's Inn-road scheme, 1732–1735.

Illustration in the case of the Gray's Inn-road improvement of the great importance of repealing the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; complete ruin of this locality and of the shopkeepers by the restrictions in this section, 1735, 1736——Complete change of the local population since 1875; 1735. 1738——Provision of accommodation for 1,300 persons in the immediate neighbourhood of this site by private individuals, 1736——Different classes for whom it is essential that dwellings should be provided in the locality, in order that they may be near their place of employment, 1738-1741——Reduced overcrowding in witness' district, 1742.

Several improvement schemes put forward in the Holborn district, which have been rejected by the Metropolitan Board, a very good scheme having in the first instance been prepared by the officers of the Board, but not adopted, 1743-1751——The Act of 1875 has not in fact been loyally carried out in the district by the Metropolitan Board; examination as to witness' grounds for this conclusion, 1743. 1771–1808.

Exceedingly beneficial operation of Mr. Torrens' Acts in the Holborn district, 1749. 1752–1756—— Several amendments required in these Acts; expediency of some remuneration of the surveyor and officers who carry them out, 1755——Mischievous result of the congregation of large numbers of working people at Walthamstow; very bad class of houses erected in this locality, 1757-1764.

Opinion that artizans' dwellings should be erected in all parts of the metropolis for the accommodation of a portion of the people displaced by improvement schemes, 1765-1770——Admission as to the Metropolitan Board having carried out the Act of 1875, but not in a loyal spirit; mistake also in their adopting the plans of Mr. Vigers' instead of those of their own officers, 1771–1808.

[Second Examination.]—Further consideration of the different schemes promoted in respect of the Gray's Inn-road, witness repeating that the Board were wrong in adopting Mr. Vigers' plans, 1809–1813——Decided approval of the arrangement of the Board under the Streets Improvement Act of 1877 for dealing with the insanitary portion of the area, 1814–1816.

Stoppage of progress for the last five years in respect of the Gray's Inn-road scheme by the requirements of the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; ruin of shopkeepers and others by the removal or closing of houses for sanitary reasons, without prompt provision being made for the people displaced, 1817-1820. 1836–1843. 1891–1895——Decided opinion that the 33rd section should either be abolished or greatly modified, 1820–1822——Impracticability under this section of replacing the costermonger class in artizans' dwellings, 1820.

Objection to the Metropolitan Board engaging in building operations, 1882. 1857——Suggestion that by way of premium on the erection of artizans' and labourers' dwellings by private individuals, these places be exempted from taxation; failure, on the whole, of private enterprise to supply the want, 1822, 1823. 1831-1835. 1848-1850——Difficulty in showing before any large number of dilapidated houses are pulled down that accommodation is available within a certain radius for those displaced, 1824–1826——All the new artizans' dwellings in witness' district are quite full, 1826—— Hardship in people being removed to such a distance as to be obliged to walk several miles to and from their work, 1827–1830.

Very low price for which the land was obtained for the private blocks of buildings near the Gray's Inn-road, 1832–1835. 1858, 1859——Numerous places in the metropolis still to be dealt with under the Acts of 1875 and 1879; more rapid progress if the local authorities were more free to take action, 1844, 1845——Absence of empty houses for artizans in the Holborn district, 1847.

Strong objection of the local authority for Holborn to ask for a rate for the erection of improved dwellings, 1851–1857——Reconstruction by private individuals of houses demolished by the local authority; erection also of some new buildings through the land having been given by the Metropolitan Board almost for nothing, 1856. 1858-1860——

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Gibbon, Dr. Septimus. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Information in connection with the displacement of working classes by the Holborn Viaduct, and the limited provision compulsorily made for their accommodation in new buildings, 1861-1877.

Necessity of some bonus as an inducement to private enterprise to erect artizans' dwellings, 1877——Importance attached by employers to local residences for their workpeople, 1878-1880——Different localities to which the people displaced by the Gray's Inn-road operations have removed; overcrowding and bad sanitary arrangements in some of these places, 1881-1890——Expediency of the Metropolitan Board being still required to devote part of the Gray's Inn-road area to artizans' dwellings, prompt action being greatly needed, 1891-1895.

Objection to the Peabody Buildings as being too prison-like and as going too much on the barrack system, 1896, 1897——Approval of the buildings erected by Sir Sydney Waterlow's Company; good sanitary arrangements in force, 1898——Effect of the demolition of houses in causing overcrowding unless prompt action be taken, 1899——Excellent character of the Palmerston Buildings in Goswell-road, the ground floor being used for shops; this plan might be adopted in the case of Gray's Inn-road, 1900-1902.

Gilbert, The Rev. Canon. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Intimate acquaintance of witness with the Spitalfields, Tower-hill, and other districts of the City of London, 1179-1181——Very prejudicial effect of the improvements and clearances in the City upon business localities, such as Petticoat-lane, 1181—— Decided objection to any extensive modification of the requirement that where people are displaced by schemes under the Artizans' Dwellings Act the same amount of accommodation must be provided for them in the same neighbourhood; insufficiency of providing for only two-fifths of those displaced, 1183-1188.

Information relative to the occupations of the people removed from the Tower-hill locality; importance of these living for the most part close to their work, 1183. 1188——Several objections to the labouring classes of the metropolis living in the suburbs and travelling in and out by railway, 1188——Great facilities as regards cheap markets by living in London instead of in the suburbs, *ib.*——Loss of time and social disadvantage where men have to travel any distance to their work and are separated from their families throughout the day, *ib.*

Ruin to many of the lower classes by pulling down their homes and giving them a small compensation, without providing new homes for them near their work, 1189——Reference to the Peabody Buildings as beyond the price that the poor who are displaced can afford to pay; grounds for this statement, 1189. 1195. 1203-1211. 1235, 1236. 1355. 1356. 1366. 1374-1377——Bad effect socially and politically through the poorer classes not being properly cared for as regards their dwellings, 1189. 1197, 1198——Increased rents since the Peabody Buildings and model lodging-houses have come into operation, 1189-1191. 1211. 1370-1372.

Great importance of the gradual removal of slums, proper provision being made at the same time for the re-housing of those who are displaced, 1192——Facility and priority to be given to those who are removed, as regards rooms in new buildings, 1192——Several classes for whom the Peabody Buildings are not suitable, there being no admission of these, 1192. 1236. 1251-1253——Belief as to there being much overcrowding through local provision not having being made for those displaced at Tower-hill, 1193, 1194.

Expediency of the Metropolitan Board being bound to provide cheap accommodation for those displaced by their improvements, 1195-1198. 1220-1226——Particulars relative to the assistance given to those in need by means of a night refuge founded by witness, 1198-1202——Advantage doubtless in each family having two rooms instead of one; great disadvantage on the other hand by living in the suburbs, if otherwise the working classes cannot pay for two rooms, 1212-1220——Belief as to the decided preference of labouring men to live in London, 1213-1220.

Consideration of a statement as to the people displaced by certain improvements having been offered rooms at a low rent in the Peabody Buildings, and having gone elsewhere, 1227-1236——Numerous instances in which the earnings of the men are supplemented by those of his wife and children in the neighbourhood of their homes; obstacle on this score to their removal to the suburbs, 1237-1247. 1250——Loss of the society of friends, and loss of amusements by removal from London, 1248, 1249.

Further statement upon the question of the rents being too high in the Peabody Buildings for the poorer working classes, it being explained to witness that the average rent is only 1 *s.* 11½ *d.* per room, 1254-1257——Indirect reduction of rent per room by sub-letting and by taking in lodgers; disapproval of this practice, on moral grounds, if it can possibly be avoided, 1257-1277——Sanitary improvement by pulling down old and crowded habitations in different localities, but with much detriment to those dislodged, 1262, 1263.

Witness repeats that it is essential to provide cheaper dwellings for the people than are now available in the Peabody Buildings, and suggests that the rents should be lowered

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Gilbert, The Rev. Canon. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

lowered by the trustees, and that part of the capital fund should be spent for this purpose, 1264-1287——Strong objection of the respectable labouring classes to go into common lodging-houses, 1271-1276.

Further statement as to the bad social effect of driving the poorer classes out of their homes; great impetus thereby to democracy and republicanism, 1277. 1301-1303——Continual complaint by the people that the Peabody trustees have not fulfilled their duties, and that the trust was intended for the benefit of the very poor, 1278.

Further suggestions as to the price or cost at which the Metropolitan Board should provide dwellings for the people displaced by their improvement operations; equitable obligation upon the Board to do something for those whose interests they have injured, 1288-1299——Importance doubtless of healthy dwellings; still greater importance of sufficient food and clothing, 1298, 1299.

Difficulty in tracing the subsequent movements of the people whose houses have been pulled down; great hardship in numerous instances where they have been compelled to live at a considerable distance from their work, 1300-1317. 1327, 1328——Loss of their means of living by many of those displaced by the Petticoat-lane improvements, 1300, 1301——Strong and bitter feeling among the people themselves as to the injuries inflicted upon them when deprived of their homes by sanitary or building improvements, 1301-1303. 1315. 1317.

Instances of the emigration of small shopkeepers and others displaced by improvements; hardship when this course is forced upon people strongly opposed to it, 1302, 1303. 1321, 1322——Considerable number of the labouring classes unemployed at different periods of the year; question hereon as to the hardship in these being transported to places where employment is plentiful, 1318-1326——Desire of a large number of those who have been driven into the suburbs to come back into London if there were suitable accommodation for them, 1328.

Reference to the operation generally of the Acts of 1868 and 1875, witness further submitting that it should be obligatory upon the Metropolitan Board to provide cheap and suitable lodgings in any district where the houses of the poor are destroyed by improvements, 1330-1335——Great hardship in the case of widows with children, and upon single women, driven from their place of work into the suburbs, and compelled to travel from a distance to their employment, 1336-1340——Means of the local authorities, as in the Bethnal Green district, for providing four-storeyed buildings at cheap rates, concurrently with the removal of slums, 1341-1350.

Objection by many of the labouring poor, especially the Irish, not only to registered lodging-houses but to the Peabody Buildings as not conducive to morality, 1350, 1351——Preference of the people for their present homes, as compared with improved sanitary dwellings, or with residence in the suburbs at a distance from their work; several grounds for such preference, 1352-1364——Loss of time and earnings when men are obliged to go to their work a long distance by railway, 1360.

Expediency of the first offer of rooms in new buildings being given to the people displaced, 1365——Importance of cheaper rents than in the Peabody Buildings; approval of simpler and rougher accommodation so long as cheapness is secured, 1365-1377. 1385-1387——Objection of the people to the rules and restrictions in the Peabody Buildings 1373——Question considered as to the connection between low rents and low wages; doubt as to sackmakers and others being worse paid if their rents were lower, 1378-1384.

Glasgow. Official inquiry made by witness in 1877 into the subject of the erection of labourers' dwellings in Glasgow, and the working of the Glasgow Improvements Act of 1876; *Grant* 732-737——Details relative to the operations of the Corporation of Glasgow under this Act and under Amendment Acts in 1871 and 1880; great advantage from the absence of such restrictions as are in force in the metropolis respecting the use to be made of cleared areas and the replacement of the people displaced by the removal of schemes, *ib.* 735-738, 772-778.

Extensive demolition of bad tenements in Glasgow, concurrently with important street improvements, while no difficulty has been experienced as to the re-housing of the population; ample accommodation available in the form of empty houses for the people displaced, *Grant* 736. 742-758——Very limited extent to which the authorities have provided new dwellings for the labouring classes; provision of some lodging-houses for men or women without families, *ib.* 736. 776-778. 786-789.

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long and extensive experience of witness as chief surveyor and valuer to the Metropolitan Board; aggregate of about 7,000,000 *l.* as the value of the properties respecting which he has advised the Board, 139, 140.

Summary of the steps taken by the Board consequent on the interim Report of the Select Committee of last Session, dated 2nd August; progress since made in the clearance of the several areas, 141-143——Reports by the engineer and architect to the

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Board as to the vacant accommodation available for artizans displaced, and as to the facilities of transit, 141. 149. 163——Relaxation obtained from the Secretary of State of certain conditions in the Provisional Orders which interfered with the letting of the land, 141—— Large amount of information obtained from the local or district authorities as to the number of vacant cottages available for artizans, 141. 149, 150.

Decision arrived at since last Session that future sites shall be sold, under revised conditions as to the erection of artizans' dwellings, instead of being let on lease, 141. 144, 145 —— Importance of the revised condition whereby purchasers are to be bound only for a term of ten years in the erection of artizans' dwellings; approval by the Home Secretary of this relaxation in respect of several sites, 141. 144, 145. 152, 153. 159–162*—— Unavoidable delay sometimes under the conditions of sale in pulling down the old houses and in the removal of the materials, 142, 143.

Particulars relative to the position of the Board, and the progress made, as on 1st March 1882, in respect of the several artizans' schemes for which Provisional Orders have been obtained, 146–148——Total of fourteen schemes taken in hand by the Board, of which the larger portion has been thoroughly dealt with, and the land is fit for building upon, 148.

Efforts made by the Board and its officers under the Amending Act of 1879, with a view to the acquisition of alternative sites within a three-mile radius of the cleared areas; extreme difficulty in procuring any eligible sites, 155–158.

[Second Examination.]—Further explanation as to the extensive professional experience of witness; he has advised the Board upon the purchase of the various properties included in the schemes under the Act of 1875; 505–509.

Statement of the estimated cost of the land required under the Whitechapel and Limehouse scheme, the estimate for roads and sewers, and the estimated recoupment, 510. 534 ——Horrible condition of some of the courts and tenements comprised in this scheme; exceedingly small value put upon this property, 511, 512. 516. 520–524——Expediency of allowing merely the value of the land and materials where the houses are so insanitary and dilapidated as to be past remedy, 512. 516-518.

Basis of witness' valuation in cases where by a certain expenditure the houses can be made sanitary and habitable, 512. 516. 520-524——Provision in the Act under which no allowance is to be made for trade compensation, 512——Great difficulty in arriving at the market value; frequency of excessive compensation under the Lands Clauses Act of 1845 in cases of street improvement, 513——Improved practice as to compensation under the Act of 1875; abandonment of the former system of allowing twenty years for freeholds and sixteen years for leaseholds, however good or bad the property, 513–516.

Great evil in the worse class of houses being held by middlemen, who screw the tenants down to the last farthing and do little or nothing for the property, 517——Utterly deplorable condition of the large amount of poor property held by the late Thomas Flight, *ib.* ——Instance of some property in Lincoln-court, Drury-lane, in a horribly insanitary state; excessive compensation awarded by the arbitrator in this case, 517. 589–594.

Ownership of bad property chiefly by small tradesmen, 525——Necessity of the Metropolitan Board often paying more than the market value for insanitary property, 526, 527 ——Excessive valuation put upon property by witnesses before the arbitrators; unreliable evidence frequently given on oath before juries, 528. 530.

Particular instances of claims under the Goulston-street scheme, showing the amount of the claim, provisional award, final award, Board's valuation, and the amount given by the jury, 528, 529—— Reference especially to the large claim made by a fishmonger, the grounds upon which based, and the amount finally given, 529. 584–588——In the Whitechapel scheme the matter was left entirely to Sir Henry Hunt, as standing arbitrator, the Board not appealing in any case, 528, 529. 544, 545——Instances of extensive claims under the Essex-road scheme; great difference between the original claims and the amounts given by the jury, 529, 530—— Similar instances under the Whitecross-street scheme; reduction of one claim from 47,052 *l.* to 19,750 *l.*; 530.

Vast amount of care bestowed by the Chairman and other members of the Metropolitan Board, as well as by witness and other officers, upon the several schemes under the Acts of 1875 and 1879; 531——Particulars with reference to the original estimate for each scheme, the actual cost, the recoupment and the loss; table on the subject handed in to the Committee, 532–540——Total of 421,677 *l.* agreed to in settlement by the Board directly, the total by arbitration being 807,179 *l.*; 540.

Further table submitted showing the total area taken under each scheme, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, 541——Aggregate of 130,906 *l.* as the value of the land thrown into public streets, 542, 543——Great difficulty in dealing with claims for trade compensation in the smaller class of cases, 546——Very large sums necessarily given by the Board for public-houses; instances to this effect, witness handing in a table on the subject, 547.

Frequency

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Frequency of the sites upon which the worst class of buildings stand being more valuable than the tenements themselves; enhanced sum awarded for sites through the surrounding circumstances being an element in the valuation, 548, 549——Greatly enhanced value of the sites if they could be sold for commercial purposes; in such case the operations of the Board would result almost in a profit, 550–554.

Stringent conditions in the letting of the land, so as to ensure the sites being used for the specified purposes, 555, 556——Expediency of the condition as to the superintending architect of the Board being sole arbitrator, 555——Regulation of the price by the conditions and by the requirements as to the replacement of the population on the same area, 556——Necessity of an additional storey on the Great Wild-street building in order to provide the required accommodation, 557, 558.

Efforts of the Board to sell the Whitechapel and Limehouse area before their acceptance of the offer of the Peabody Trustees for portion of this area and for five other sites at 3*d.* per foot; belief that under the circumstances they have got the fair commercial value, 559–563——Reference to a letter from Lord Derby, as Chairman of the Peabody Trust, as showing that the Board had good reason for believing they could not get a higher price for the sites collectively, 559, 560.

Great difficulty experienced by the Board in acquiring artizans' sites, other than those included in the schemes; necessity of such sites being within a limited radius of the cleared areas, 564–566——Authority now obtained by the Board from the Home Secretary for the summary removal of unhealthy tenements in any of the schemes; belief that this permission was first given subsequently to the Report of the Select Committee of last Session, 567–571——Comment upon the action of the local authorities in putting pressure upon the Board as to the repair of dilapidated houses of which they have become owners and which they intend soon to remove, 572–574.

Further expression of the opinion that the ratepayers should only pay the value of the ground and materials in the case of tenements unfit for human habitation; mode of estimating such value, 575. 606, 607——Instances in support of the conclusion that no sufficiently stringent law is enforced upon the owners of houses unfit for habitation, 576——Advantage if the local medical officers were appointed by the Home Secretary instead of by the vestries; difficulty at present in their being independent of vestrymen who hold bad property, 576, 577. 637——Obstacle to the application of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts in cases where only a few houses are to be dealt with; action left to the vestries in these cases, 578–582.

Grounds for the opinion that no interest either of lease or agreement for lease should be considered valid if made after the Provisional Order had been announced; great number of "bogus" interests now put forward, 583. 639, 640. 649——Insufficieney of a period of nine months (as suggested by Mr. Richardson), after the final award has been given, within which the entire matter should be completed and the land thrown open for public use, 583——Circumstance of 500 abstracts having in one week been sent in to the Metropolitan Board, *ib.*

Paper submitted showing the alteration in the orignal tender for the Whitechapel site, 583——Statement showing the conditions of letting in the case of Northumberland Avenue, *ib.*

Comment upon income tax receipts as evidence of trade profits; result of information given by witness on this subject to Government, 588——Way in which the amount of compensation is arrived at in the case of isolated plots of land in the middle of a scheme, with houses all round, 595–597——Illustration of the objection of people displaced to remove into Peabody Buildings close by, 598.

Grounds for the opinion that the Metropolitan Board might advantageously provide model lodging-houses of a more plain and less luxurious character than the Peabody Buildings or the improved industrial dwellings, for the accommodation of the lower classes displaced by schemes under the Acts of 1875 and 1879; 598*–600——Use of the Peabody Buildings by a much better class than are dispossessed by improvement schemes, 599. 610–612——Calculation that, subject to the original loss on the cleared areas, buildings provided by the Board would return a profit of from four to five per cent., 601–605.

Objection to artizans' buildings higher than five storeys; preference for low buildings on sanitary grounds, 608, 609. 634, 635——Important influence of improved dwellings upon the moral, social, and intellectual advancement of the people, 612.

Statement showing that in the case of the Sun-street to Worship-street Improvement, the people displaced went to different outskirts instead of remaining in the old neighbourhood, 613–615. 619–625. 658——Expediency of all railways being compelled to run workmen's trains as cheaply as the Great Eastern Company, 616–618——Conclusion as to the desire of the working classes to live in the suburbs if there were cheap railway facilities, 619–625.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Reluctance of the lower grade of the labouring classes to submit to the rules in the Peabody Buildings for the enforcement of cleanliness and order; great antagonism of these people to habits of cleanliness, 626-633 ——The amount of rent in the Peabody Buildings is by no means prohibitory, 632——Opinion that much more might have been done by the vestries in the improvement of slums, 636-638.

Belief as to much fraud being practised in connection with leases when excessive claims are being supported, 639, 640——Benefit rather than hardship to the people themselves in breaking up their associations and style of living, and in diffusing them among different localities, 641-648. 657, 658——Dishonest character of some of those affected by the Newport Market improvement; accommodation available in the Peabody Buildings in Westminster for people displaced by this improvement, 645-647.

Concurrence in the suggestion that after a certain point has been reached in each scheme compensation claims should not be allowed for any improvement except made by compulsion or for sanitary purposes, 650, 651.

Average loss by the Board of two-thirds of the total cost of the land, 652, 653——Probable loss of not more than fifteen per cent. if the land could be sold for commercial purposes, 654-656——General average loss of seventy-five per cent. upon street improvements, 654, 655——Exceptional instances of the people displaced by schemes under the Acts of 1875 and 1879 returning to the same locality, 657, 658.

Double expense under the present system of appeal; opinion that the appeal to the arbitrator should be final, 659-666——Approval of claimants going before the arbitrator alone, instead of their having the option of going first to a jury, 659-664.

More expensive proceedings before juries than before arbitrators; probability of fairer compensation awards by the latter, 662——Promotion of more schemes by the Metropolitan Board if freed from the restrictions on the sale of the land, 667, 668.

[Third Examination.]—Correction of former statement as to 500 abstracts having been sent in to the office of the Board in one week, 669, 670——Correction also of statement as to the loss being only fifteen per cent. if the sites were sold for commercial purposes, 671-673——Explanation that the average loss on all the schemes under the Artizans' Act is eighty-two per cent., whilst the average loss on street improvements is seventy-five per cent., 674-680.

Suggestion that the 3rd section of the Act of 1879 might be usefully amended by requiring the jury or arbitrator in each case to state that in giving a certain sum for compensation they had taken into consideration so much for the cost of repairing the premises, 681-683—— Suggestion also that this section might be further amended by the jury or arbitrator being required to state the amount allowed for the abatement of any nuisance proved to exist, 683-688.

Consideration of the interpretation of Section 4 of the Act of 1879 as to relaxation by the Home Secretary in the event of sufficient accommodation being available outside the area embraced in the scheme, 689-692——Circumstance of the Board not having applied for relaxation under the 4th section on account of the difficulty of acquiring new sites within a short distance of the cleared areas, 693-695.

Further statement upon the question of the Board being empowered to build; careful calculation made in 1875 as to the financial result, 696-703—— Great advantage probably in the case of Newport Market site if the Board had authority to build; that is, with a view to providing for the very poor, 702, 703——Importance of there being no delay in covering this site so that the western improvements may be expedited, 702.

Better class of tenements to which the displaced people have removed, though they have not gone into the Peabody Buildings, 704-707——Advantage of displacement if it tends to disperse associations of thieves or prostitutes, 708-712——Approval of its being left to the confirming authority, subject to the Secretary of State, to inquire into and to decide in each case how far it is necessary to provide accommodation for the people displaced, 713-717.

Total of 22,000 disturbed by the schemes hitherto, provision being made for 2,209 in excess of this number, 718, 719——Inexpediency of extensive displacement without any obligation under Act to make new provision; discretion to be exercised by the Home Secretary, 720, 721——Explanation of the basis of witness' calculation of the per-centages of the different improvements; necessity of making large allowance for street approaches, &c., in reduction of the area for sale, 722-729.

[Fourth Examination.]—Statement submitted showing where the people displaced by the Sun-street and Worship-street improvements went to, and the rents they paid on removal, 1564——Total of 1,547 persons displaced by different improvements, whom the Metropolitan Board were obliged to re-house under the provisions of the Street Improvements Act of 1872; 1565.

Exceeding stringency as regards the Board of the obligations imposed by Sections 48 & 49 of the Act of 1872; reference more especially to the requirement as to notices before

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

before fifteen houses can be taken in any parish, 1566-1578. 1612. 1672-1674——Advertisement of the Clerkenwell-road site for the first time in February 1879, an offer of 300 *l.* having been accepted in May 1880, and the buildings being now nearly completed, 1570——Erection of buildings upon seven out of the nine sites acquired by the Board, 1571, 1572——Advantage of the proviso whereby if the Board could not within three years let the sites for artizans' dwellings, they might sell them for commercial purposes; unwillingness of the Board to put this proviso in force, 1573-1579. 1680-1683.

Ground for complaint as to the operation of the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; great delay and difficulty through the proviso that the Board shall not remove fifteen houses before they have provided adequate accommodation for the people displaced, 1574. 1580 *et seq.*——Total of 10,129 persons to be re-housed under the provisions of the Act of 1877; different improvements in respect of which this number is made up, 1580, 1581.

Provision for the housing of 2,070 persons out of 5,497 affected by the improvements from Piccadilly to Bloomsbury, and from Charing Cross to Oxford-street; reduction feasible in the latter number, 1581-1595——Facilities in the foregoing case but for the requirement as to not removing more than fifteen houses at a time, 1581-1595——Wretched sanitary condition of some houses inspected by witness between Rupert-street and Macclesfield-street, 1581.

Accommodation to be provided for 1,725 persons on the Gray's Inn-road site; proposal for re-housing 300 of these, the rest being compensated with small sums and being left to find lodgings in other localities, 1598-1609. 1619-1623. 1684-1687——Great value of the Gray's Inn-road frontage if it can be utilised for commercial purposes, instead of being devoted to artizans' dwellings; probable loss of 300,000 *l.* if the latter requirement were enforced, 1598-1600. 1619. 1675-1679. 1699-1703.

Conclusion as to the expediency of the 33rd section being inoperative in the case of the Gray's Inn-road improvement, it being proposed instead to satisfy the Home Secretary, or a magistrate, that the people displaced had been enabled to find suitable lodgings elsewhere, 1601. 1612. 1684-1687——Different ways in which those displaced may be accommodated; migratory character of the people, 1601-1608. 1707. 1711-1716——Steps taken by the Board with a view to the purchase and substitution of other sites for the erection of artizans' buildings; great difficulty experienced, 1609.

Alternative site sanctioned by the Home Secretary in lieu of the Tooley-street site; excess accommodation provided in this case, 1610——Considerable excess provided in respect of the clearance in Jamaica-road, *ib.*——Large excess also as compared with the number to be accommodated in connection with the Camberwell and Peckham improvement, *ib.*

Great importance of the proposed Southwark and Great Dover-street communication, it being intended to devote the main portion of the property to artizans' dwellings; exceedingly low class of houses to be removed in this case, 1610, 1611——Necessity in order to carry out the foregoing improvement effectually, of the Metropolitan Board being relieved from the obligation as to not taking down more than fifteen houses, 1611, 1612.

Further statement as to the importance generally of the Board being relieved from the restrictions in the 33rd section; reference hereon to communications from the Home Office in December 1879 and June 1880 as to the obligations upon the Board under this section, 1612-1616. 1631-1635. 1684-1691——Absence of power in the Board to let under the full market value any vacant building sites not devoted by Act of Parliament to the erection of artizans' dwellings, 1615.

Improbability that even one per cent. of the labourers displaced from the slums in the Gray's Inn-road would become permanent occupiers of improved dwellings on the same site, 1615——Questionable expediency in the poorer ratepayers being taxed for the purpose of the erection of dwellings to be occupied by artizans of a higher class, *ib.*——Enormous sacrifice if the Board were bound to accommodate the labouring classes on the Northumberland Avenue site, *ib.*——Displacement of 1,622 persons by the Southwark and Great Dover-street scheme, for all of whom accommodation is to be provided, 1617, 1618.

Opinion that the Board should have full power to use the ground, when cleared, for any purpose; the people displaced can obtain accommodation within a reasonable distance without much difficulty, 1620, 1621. 1653. 1711-1716——Desire of the Board to provide accommodation on the cleared sites wherever the land is not commercially valuable, 1622, 1623.

Explanation as to the Clerkenwell-road improvement not having been commenced till 1879, the Act having been obtained in 1872; 1624-1629——Reference to the Act of 1872 as first imposing any obligation upon the Board as to re-housing the labouring classes; witness makes no special complaint respecting the notice, &c., under this Act, 1630.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Compensation given in sums from 1 *l.* to 4 *l.* to the people displaced by the Sun-street to Worship-street scheme; satisfaction of the people with this plan, whilst they moved into houses infinitely better than those pulled down, 1636–1639——Great difficulty in overcoming the repugnance of the lower classes to live in improved dwellings, 1637.

Total of 348 people displaced by the Clerkenwell-road improvement; considerable frontage taken in this case, 1640–1643——Obstacle under the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 to the provision of other sites in the same localities for the accommodation of those displaced by the foregoing improvement, 1644——Satisfaction with which witness hears that improved workmen's buildings have been put up on an extensive scale in this locality through the liberal conduct of certain landlords, 1645–1652.

Further statement as to the difficulty experienced by the Metropolitan Board in acquiring sites in proximity to improvement schemes, though it is represented to witness that several large employers have succeeded in doing so, 1652. 1658–1671——Considerable accommodation to be provided in Pye-street, this being available in respect of the Western Improvement Scheme rather than as regards the Gray's Inn-lane improvement, 1654–1657——Greater difficulty of the Board than of private individuals in acquiring sites on reasonable terms, 1669–1671.

Insufficiency of a modification as regards the non-removal of more than fifteen houses at a time, by extending the number to fifty or sixty houses, 1688–1691——Consideration of the question whether land at the back in the Gray's Inn-road scheme could not be utilised for artizans' dwellings, leaving all the frontage for commercial purposes; witness will prepare a plan on this basis, 1692–1698. 1717–1723——Considerable loss in connection with the foregoing improvement even if the site be used for commercial purposes, 1699–1703——Very important thoroughfare opened out by means of this improvement, 1704.

Obstacle, as a rule, to the use of the upper floors of new buildings for artizans' dwellings, and of the lower floor for shops, 1705, 1706——Rejection as insufficient of a scheme formerly promoted by the Board for dealing with Tyndall's Buildings, 1708–1710——Approval generally of a system whereby some of the people displaced by the clearance of slums should be re-housed in the same locality or district, whilst others should receive small money compensation and be allowed to select their place of residence, 1711–1716.

Further statement as to the low and bad class of occupiers to be displaced by the Southwark and Great Dover-street scheme; expediency of their being provided with improved lodgings in the same locality, 1724–1729——Advantage in this case of the proposal for the use of the ground floor for shops, whilst the upper floors might be used for artizans' dwellings, 1729–1731.

[Fifth Examination.]—Further information respecting the Gray's Inn-road improvement undertaken by the Metropolitan Board; method by which the Board propose to accommodate the inhabitants who will be displaced, 3622–3674——Statement that if frontages were to be dealt with for commercial purposes the cost would be reduced one-half; great loss which would result from selling these frontages for artizans' dwellings at 2 *d.* a foot, when for commercial purposes their value is 4 *s.* a foot, 3625. 3661. 3683. 3692. 3712, 3713.

Non-objection to Parliament insisting that one particular block of buildings in the Gray's Inn-road scheme should be pulled down and sold, so that the rebuilding should be commenced before the remainder was demolished, 3626, 3627——Proposal to divide this scheme into two sections and clear one section, which would dislodge 1,930 persons at once; explanation that out of the number dislodged there would be only 500 who are resident in the place continuously, 3626. 3630, 3631. 3637. 3667–3669.

Reasons for believing that it would not be expedient to pull down one part of the area which is to be dedicated to artizans' dwellings and get it rebuilt before the part intended for commercial purposes is pulled down, 3637–3644——Intention of the Board of Works to pull down at once the houses in Gray's Inn-road as far as Liquorpond-street; when the land is in the market the applications for it are so numerous that the commercial portions will not remain uncovered for so long as three months, 3645–3647. 3656–3660——Impossibility of selling the building materials in the Gray's Inn-road scheme, on account of their being so saturated with disease and filth as to be completely useless, 3653–3656.

Possibility of the Board's plans for a new street under the Gray's Inn-road scheme being carried out by the autumnal recess, and the other portion carried through by the 25th of December, 3662–3664. 3670–3673——Further explanation of the way in which compensation cases are arranged by the Board, 3695.

Examination with further reference to the second, or the Western Improvement Scheme; pestiferous condition of the majority of the dwellings included in this scheme, 3675–3713——Proposal to substitute a site in Kentish Town for the re-habitation of the people displaced under this scheme; financial difficulty which will arise if the Board of Works

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Goddard, Frederick William. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Works are compelled to devote the whole of the property to re-housing the working classes, 3680–3693——Desire on the part of the Board to limit the demolitions as nearly as may be to those required for making the new street; otherwise a greater number of persons will be disturbed than can be accommodated in the same area, 3709, 3710.

Further information respecting the Great Dover-street to Southwark Bridge Communication; importance in this scheme of having power to make the lower storeys into shops and the first floors for the occupiers of the shops, 3714–3735——Belief that this scheme could be carried out in a year and-a-half if the required relaxation in regard to the shops is granted by Parliament, 3729–3734——Instance in which substitution of one site for another was permitted by the Home Secretary, 3736–3741.

Statement handed in showing the rateable value of the metropolis and the City, and the sums charged for artizans' dwellings by annual precept of the Metropolitan Board of Works, 3742–3753.

Golden-lane. See *City of London.*

Goulston-street, and Flower and Dean-street. Progress made with this scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148——Particular instances of claims under the Goulston-street scheme, showing the amount of the claim, provisional award, final award, Board's valuation, and the amount given by the jury, *ib.* 528, 529——Reference especially to the large claim made by a fishmonger, the grounds upon which based, and the amount finally given, *ib.* 529, 584–588.

Bad state of health and morals in the Goulston-street and the Flower and Dean-street areas, *Barnett* 3037–3039.

Statement showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Grant, John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long experience of witness as assistant engineer to the Metropolitan Board of Works; he was previously engineer for seven years to the Commissioners of Sewers, 730, 731. 774——Official inquiry made by witness in 1877 into the subject of the erection of labourer's dwellings in Glasgow, and the working of the Glasgow Improvements Act of 1876; 732–737——Details relative to the operations of the Corporation of Glasgow under this Act and under Amendment Acts in 1871 and 1880; great advantage from the absence of such restrictions as are in force in the metropolis respecting the use to be made of cleared areas and the replacement of the people displaced by the removal of slums, 735–738. 772–778.

Extensive demolition of bad tenements in Glasgow, concurrently with important street improvements, while no difficulty has been experienced as to the re-housing of the population; ample accommodation available in the form of empty houses for the people displaced, 736. 742–758——Statement as to the excess of empty houses available in London for all the population displaced by the various improvement schemes of the Metropolitan Board, the restrictions under the Artizans' Dwellings Act being unnecessary and injurious, 736–738. 759–762. 779–785——Very limited extent to which the Glasgow authorities have provided new dwellings for the labouring classes; provision of some lodging-houses for men or women without families, 736. 776–778. 786–789.

Result of witness' experience as regards Glasgow that he has been strongly of opinion since 1877 that the Metropolitan Board of Works could have carried out improvements much more effectually and economically but for the restrictions under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; he has not directly advised the Board to this effect, 738, 739. 759–779——Waste of public money by the existing restrictions in the metropolis, whilst there would be no hardship whatever in the gradual removal of slums without the present conditions as to replacement of the population, 738.

Paper submitted in explanation of witness' views upon the general question of the working of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, and the unsoundness of the principles sought to be enforced by the Acts, 739, 740——Conclusion strongly adverse to the municipal authority being required or permitted to purchase house property which had become unfit for occupation by reason of age or of neglect on the part of the owners, 739. 741. 759–762.

Expediency of the municipal authority being empowered to compel the owners of bad property to pull it down or to put it in repair, 741. 759–762——Information relative to the number of inhabited and uninhabited houses, respectively, the total population, and the proportion of persons per house, in 1871 and in 1881; conclusion as to it not being necessary for the Metropolitan Board to provide for artizans' buildings on the cleared areas, 779–785.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Grant, Mr. Memorandum by Mr. Grant explanatory of his views in detail as to the operation of the Acts of 1875 and 1879; total disapproval of the policy embodied in the Acts, *App.* 205-207.

Gray's Inn Road:

1. *Present Condition of the Gray's Inn-road Improvement; Difficulties through the Restrictions under the 33rd Section of the Act of 1877.*
2. *Question as to the Accommodation Provided, or to be Provided, for the People Displaced.*
3. *Question as to the Mode of dealing with the Cleared Area; Re-arrangements proposed as to Sites so as to obviate the great Cost under existing Restrictions.*

1. *Present Condition of the Gray's Inn-road Improvement; Difficulties through the Restrictions under the 33rd Section of the Act of 1877:*

Evidence as to the wretched state of the Gray's Inn-lane improvement and as to the expediency on this score of repealing the 33rd Section of the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act of 1877, *Walker* 1131-1139. 1142-1147. 1150-1173——Prejudicial effect in this case through there being no sites available within a reasonable distance, *ib.* 1132-1139.

Conclusion as to the expediency of the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 being inoperative in the case of the Gray's Inn-road improvement, it being proposed instead to satisfy the Home Secretary, or a magistrate, that the people displaced had been enabled to find suitable lodgings elsewhere, *Goddard* 1601. 1612. 1684-1687——Very important thoroughfare opened out by means of this improvement, *ib.* 1704.

Illustration in the case of the Gray's Inn-road improvement of the great importance of repealing the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; complete ruin of this locality and of the shopkeepers by the restrictions in this section, *Gibbon* 1735, 1736——Consideration of the different schemes promoted in respect of the Gray's Inn-road, witness considering that the Board were wrong in adopting Mr. Vigers' plans, *ib.* 1743-1751. 1771-1813.

Decided approval of the arrangement of the Board under the Streets Improvement Act of 1877 for dealing with the insanitary portion of the area, *Gibbon* 1814-1816——Stoppage of progress for the last five years by the requirements of the 33rd section of the Act; ruin of shopkeepers and others by the removal or closing of houses for sanitary reasons, without prompt provision being made for the people displaced, *ib.* 1817-1820. 1836-1843. 1891-1895.

Strong disapproval of leaving the Gray's Inn-road site unbuilt upon for three years after demolition; the loss of three years' rental in this case is a gross waste of money, *Miss Hill* 3344-3349——Impossibility of selling the building materials in the scheme on account of their being so saturated with disease and filth as to be completely useless, *Goddard* 3653-3656.

Plan submitted by Mr. Goddard explanatory of the Gray's Inn-road Improvement Scheme, under the Streets Improvement Act of 1877, *App.* 236.

2. *Question as to the Accommodation Provided, or to be Provided, for the People Displaced:*

Accommodation to be provided for 1,725 persons on the Gray's Inn-road site; proposal for re-housing 300 of these, the rest being compensated with small sums and being left to find lodgings in other localities, *Goddard* 1598-1609. 1619-1623. 1684-1687—— Improbability that even one per cent. of the labourers displaced from the slums in the Gray's Inn-road would become permanent occupiers of improved dwellings on the same site, *ib.* 1615.

Complete change of the local population since 1875, *Gibbon* 1735. 1738——Provision of accommodation for 1,300 persons in the immediate neighbourhood of this site by private individuals, *ib.* 1736——Several classes for whom it is essential that dwellings should be provided in the locality, in order that they may be near their place of employment, *ib.* 1738-1741.

Very low price for which the land was obtained for the private blocks of buildings near the Gray's Inn-road, *Gibbon* 1832-1835. 1858, 1859——Different localities to which the people displaced by the Gray's Inn-road operations have removed; overcrowding and bad sanitary arrangements in some of these places, *ib.* 1881-1890—— Expediency of the Metropolitan Board being still required to devote part of the area to artizans' dwellings, prompt action being greatly needed, *ib.* 1891-1895.

Further information respecting this improvement, and the method by which the Board propose to accommodate the inhabitants who will be displaced, *Goddard* 3622-3674—— Proposal to divide the scheme into two sections and clear one section, which would dislodge 1,930 persons at once; explanation that out of the number disloged there would be only 500 who are resident in the place continuously, *ib.* 3626. 3630, 3631. 3637. 3667-3669.

3. *Question*

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Gray's Inn Road—continued.

3. *Question as to the Mode of dealing with the Cleared Area; Re-arrangements proposed as to Sites so as to obviate the great Cost under existing Restrictions:*

Consideration of the question whether certain sites or frontages are not available within a reasonable distance of Gray's Inn-lane, the difficulty really being as to the cost; great sacrifice if these spaces were used for artizans' dwellings instead of for commercial purposes, *Walker* 1150-1173.

Great value of the Gray's Inn-road frontage if it can be utilised for commercial purposes, instead of being devoted to artizans' dwellings; probable loss of 300,000 *l.* if the latter requirement were enforced, *Goddard* 1598-1600. 1619. 1675-1679. 1699-1703——Consideration of the question whether land at the back in the Gray's Inn-road Scheme could not be utilised for artizans' dwellings, leaving all the frontage for commercial purposes; witness will prepare a plan on this basis, *ib.* 1692-1698. 1717-1723——Considerable loss even if the site be used for commercial purposes, *ib.* 1699-1703.

Statement that if frontages were to be dealt with for commercial purposes the cost would be reduced one-half; great loss which would result from selling these frontages for artizans' dwellings at 2 *d.* a foot when for commercial purposes their value is 4 *s.* a foot, *Goddard* 3625. 3661. 3683. 3692. 3712, 3713.

Non-objection to Parliament insisting that one particular block of buildings should be pulled down and sold, so that the rebuildings should be commenced before the remainder was demolished, *Goddard* 3626, 3627——Reasons for believing that it would not be expedient to pull down one part of the area which is to be dedicated to artizans' dwellings and get it rebuilt before the part intended for commercial purposes is pulled down, *ib.* 3637-3644.

Intention of the Metropolitan Board to pull down at once the houses in Gray's Inn-road as far as Liquorpond-street; when the land is in the market the applications for it are so numerous that the commercial portions will not remain uncovered for so long as three months, *Goddard* 3645-3647. 3656-3666——Possibility of the Board's scheme for a new street being carried out by the end of the autumnal recess and the other portion carried through by the 25th December, *ib.* 3662-3664, 3670-3673.

Enormous outlay thrown on the Metropolitan Board by the obligation to rebuild artizans' dwellings with a frontage to Gray's Inn-lane; expediency of permitting the Board to provide other dwellings at a less cost within reasonable distance, *Miss Hill* 3332-3350.

Consideration by the Committee of the proposals of the Metropolitan Board in reference to Gray's Inn-road Improvement scheme; approval of the Board being relieved from certain restrictions as a condition of their at once going on with this scheme, *Rep.* xii, xiii.

See also *Baldwin's Gardens.*

Great Eastern Railway (Workmen's Trains):

Establishment by the Great Eastern Railway Company of a system of workmen's trains, which came into operation more than seven years ago, *Birt* 1388-1391. 1535, 1536——Memorandum as to the obligations upon the Committee in respect of the running of workmen's trains, and as to the increased number of trains run in excess of the Parliamentary requirements; particulars hereon as to the trains from Edmonton, Enfield, Walthamstow, Stratford, Canning Town, and other places, and as to the fares charged, *ib.* 1392-1409.

Obligation to run a train daily from Edmonton and from Walthamstow to London at a fare of 2 *d.* for the return journey, *Birt* 1393——Conveyance of about 42,000 passengers weekly in the workmen's trains, the traffic being on the increase, *ib.* 1410-1413. 1451, 1452. 1539-1548——Decided loss to the company in various ways in connection with the conveyance of workmen; great interference thereby with the ordinary passenger traffic, *ib.* 1414-1425. 1476-1480. 1547. 1550, 1551——Demolition of houses for the metropolitan line of the company, in consideration of which they were put under the obligation as to workmen's trains, *ib.* 1415-1418. 1458. 1484-1487.

Inconvenience and annoyance caused to ladies and others by the workmen passengers, the latter being however an honest and intelligent class, *Birt* 1421-1425. 1500——Profit derived from certain trains not under Parliamentary obligation, where the return fare is 3 *d.* or 4 *d.*; *ib.* 1426——Chief bulk of the traffic which goes to Liverpool-street; much larger traffic from Walthamstow than from Stamford Hill, *ib.* 1455, 1456. 1465 1469. 1548.

Effect of the obligation to issue return tickets at a fare of 2 *d.* in causing the building of a large number of workmen's houses at places in the Great Eastern line; question hereon as to the effect of a similar obligation applied to other companies, *Birt* 1459-1475.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Great Eastern Railway (*Workmen's Trains*)—continued.

1501–1524. 1545, 1546——Increased staff entailed by the early running of these trains, *Birt* 1479, 1480.

Liberal interpretation by the Great Eastern Company of the obligation as to the running of workmen's trains; facilities given largely in excess of legal requirements, *Birt* 1481–1489——Improbability of any curtailment of facilities or any increase of fares notwithstanding the unprofitable character of the traffic, *ib.* 1482, 1483.

Increased facilities contemplated if the legal return fare were 4 *d.* instead of 2 *d.*, and if the company might take the traffic to and from Bishopsgate-station instead of Liverpool-street, *Birt* 1490, 1491. 1534——Powers being sought by the company to acquire additional land for railway extension near London, *ib.* 1552–1555——Equal increase relatively in the traffic where the return fare is 4 *d.*, and in the traffic where the fare is only 2 *d.*, *ib.* 1556, 1557.

Information proposed to be supplied by witness as to the number of families displaced by his company in making their metropolitan line, and as to the localities to which they removed, *Birt* 1558–1563.

Great Peter-Street (*Westminster*). Progress made with this improvement scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148.

Great Wild-Street (*Drury Lane*). Completion and occupation of the new buildings, *Goddard* 148; *Crouch* 166——Necessity of an additional storey on the Great Wild-street building in order to provide the required accommodation, *Goddard* 557, 558.

Statement showing for this scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

Return showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Greenwich. Facility as regards workmen's cottages near Greenwich if there were a tunnel in communication with the Great Eastern Railway system, *Birt* 1525–1533.

H.

Hackney. Erection of nearly 10,000 houses in Hackney in the last ten years, a large portion of these having been built for artizans, *Tripe* 1905–1908——Exceedingly bad character of a large number of houses at Hackney Wick, built before the operation of the Metropolitan Building Act of 1878; wretched materials used in construction, whilst the sanitary arrangements were exceedingly defective, *ib.* 1909–1921. 2021–2025——Usual rent of 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per room in these houses; size of the rooms, and number of tenants in proportion to the number of rooms, *ib.* 1910, 1911. 2023–2025.

Very high death rate in the small houses in Hackney Wick in 1877; reduction since that year owing to the sanitary improvements enforced by the local authorities, *Tripe* 1918–1920, 1955. 1994–1996——Constant improvements being effected at the instance of the Hackney Board of Works in the sanitary condition of the houses, *ib.* 1941–1944.

Room in the Hackney district for a further large accession of the working classes, *Tripe* 1950, 1951. 1999——Low death rate for the whole of Hackney, notwithstanding the large number of artizans and of bad houses, *ib.* 1954, 1955——Many of the people go a considerable distance to their work, *ib.* 1997, 1998.

Health. See *Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses. Overcrowding. Sanitary Arrangements. Suburbs.*

Height of Buildings. Objection to artizans' buildings higher than five storeys; preference for low buildings on sanitary grounds, *Goddard* 608, 609. 634, 635.

Hill, Miss Octavia. (Analysis of her Evidence.)—Considerable attention paid by witness for seventeen years to the subject of housing the poor in London; the particular plan of witness has been the puchasing of old houses and rebuilding them, 2977–2982.

Decided

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Hill, Miss Octavia. (Analysis of her Evidence)—*continued.*

Decided opinion that rebuilding old houses can be made to pay as much as four per cent. on both ground and buildings, 2983-2988——Desirability of suburban buildings for the increased population; opinion, however, that in the central part of London there will be as much need of house accommodation as ever, 2990-2992——Desire on the part of people who have gone to the suburbs to come back into London, 2993-2995——Approval of the working of the Artizans' Dwellings Improvement Acts; great importance of considering the details of each case, 2996-2998——Expediency of having a large number of single rooms to accommodate the lowest class of the poor who have been removed from the damp underground cellars; suggestions as to the mode of construction, 3002-3005.

[Second Examination.]—Expediency of an official inspection in order to prevent houses getting into an insanitary state; belief that in London the Sanitary Acts are sufficient if properly administered, 3232, 3233——Unsatisfactory character of many buildings erected in the suburbs, from a sanitary point of view, 3233. 3352-3354.

Belief that private individuals can carry out the object of the Artizans' Dwellings Act more economically than public bodies; instance in which four and five per cent. is not only paid but a considerable amount also is laid aside, 3240-3243. 3287. 3310. 3388-3393——Decided opinion that the population which has been displaced should be re-housed as far as possible in the same neighbourhood; large number of traders which necessitate the people living near their work, 3244-3258. 3261. 3281-3284.

Argument that in Marylebone the people must be treated differently from those in Whitechapel, as there are in the former a class of employers who require their labour; great evils which result from the separation of class from class, 3248, 3262. 3294-3305. 3324-3327——Tendency in Marylebone to rebuild houses for a slightly better class of people and so to exclude those of the lowest class; disapproval of this tendency, 3255-3258. 3301.

Great necessity for more single rooms in the industrial buildings; difficulty of getting the extreme poor into the dwellings on account of absence of single rooms, 3260. 3304. 3401-3409. 3412. 3426-3430——Decided opinion that nothing effectual can be done to improve either the dwellings or the social status of the poor, without volunteer work and actual supervision, 3260. 3314-3323. 3359-3362. 3410-3418.

Examination in regard to the particular areas in the Marylebone district which should be entirely demolished or which might be dealt with under Mr. Torrens' Act; importance in the case of demolition that the work should be done gradually, 3263-3273. 3312, 3313. 3329-3331——Rapid decay of houses in which the lowest class of the poor live, if left without repair; in a densely-crowded district the process first of repair, and then of rebuilding should be always going on, 3274-3280——Statement that bad courts are very good investments for usurers, who get an enormous rental out of the very worst courts; objection on the part of these persons to sell such property unless legislative power is put into operation against them, 3285-3293. 3369-3371.

Further information in regard to the property in which witness is interested, amounting to 60,000 *l.*; introduction of a system of co-operation by which the tenants benefit in return for the care bestowed by them upon the houses in which they live, 3306-3311. 3318. 3355-3359. 3431-3437——Method adopted by witness in dealing with the tenants of houses which are demolished before being rebuilt; long notice given to the tenants, if possible, 3311-3313.

Desire of witness that the property in which she is interested should be managed on a sound commercial basis, and pay a fair per-centage; no limit is placed on the wages of the people to whom the houses are let, 3318, 3319. 3435-3437——Lower class of tenants in witness' improved dwellings than in the Peabody Buildings and the Industrial Dwellings, 3319-3323.

Opinion that in these improvements the population that could be removed without very serious loss or discomfort would vary very much according to the district, and to the work done in the district, 3324-3326——Belief that in no part of London is there such good accommodation for the poor as in Marylebone; desire on the part of many who have left it to return, 3326.

Enormous outlay thrown on the Metropolitan Board by the obligation to rebuild artizans' dwellings with a frontage to Gray's Inn-lane; expediency of permitting the Board to provide other dwellings at a less cost within reasonable distance, 3332-3350——Strong disapproval of leaving the Gray's Inn-road site unbuilt upon for three years after demolition; the loss of three years' rental in this case is a gross waste of money, 3344-3349.

Additional statement that instead of going into a large scheme of demolition and reconstruction, the change should be attempted by degrees under Mr. Torrens' Act, 3351. 3363-3368——Decided opinion that the owners of property which has been allowed to fall into a bad and insanitary state should not receive full compensation for the surrender of the property; approval of giving in most cases only the value of the materials, 3372-3376——Inexpediency of removing the lowest class of people from any neighbour-

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Hill, Miss Octavia. (Analysis of her Evidence)—*continued.*

hood to other districts; disinclination of these persons to live with others of a higher class than themselves, 3377–3387.

Regular payment of rent by the tenants who live in witness' houses; strong feeling in favour of introducing a system of bonus for punctual payment of rent, 3394-3400—— Approval of having shops on the ground floor of the new buildings, 3419-3421——System adopted by witness in charging rents to her tenants, so that there may be no temptation to sublet, 3422–3425.

Hodson, Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a messenger of the United States Legation, and resides at Shaftesbury-street, Hoxton; is also Secretary to a working men's saving fund, 2649, 2650. 2657. 2700.

Strong opinion in favour of the industrial dwellings for men with families; witness has lived for seven years in one of these buildings; complete privacy enjoyed by the tenants, 2651, 2652. 2654, 2655. 2696-2699. 2711-2722——Entire absence of restriction on the liberty of the tenants in these buildings, 2651 —— Numerous cases in which workmen have gone to live in the suburbs and have been obliged to return to town again; enhanced cost of living in the country on account of the absence of markets, 2653, 2654, 2668–2670. 2704–2706.

Desirability of having children's playgrounds in connection with model buildings; possibility of utilising the flat roofs of the buildings for this purpose, 2654, 2655. 2707. 2723–2725——Impossibility for witness, who was formerly a compositor, to have gone into the country, away from his work, 2656. 2668——Information respecting the saving fund of which witness is secretary; scheme suggested by the churchwarden of St Mathew's, City-road, by which working men may devote their savings to the building of model dwellings, and so become their own landlords, 2657–2667. 2701.

Expediency of the State having power to demolish houses unfit for habitation and to erect upon the sites suitable dwellings; suggestion that this system of demolition should be carried out piecemeal so as to avoid as far as possible any injury to the inhabitants, 2671–2693. 2741–2744——Belief that very few of the working men of the better class with good wages would be affected by the demolition of bad insanitary houses, 2691, 2692——Inexpediency of making a money compensation to the people dispossessed, notwithstanding that they would be satisfied with such arrangement; overcrowding in the immediate neighbourhood which would follow upon dispossession with a money compensation, 2695——Numerous instances in which working men belong to building societies, 2701–2703.

Reasons for believing that lending libraries in the industrial dwellings would not be entirely successful 2708–2710——Facilities which exist for workmen to get by omnibuses and trains to and from Hoxton; explanation that Hoxton cannot be considered a suburb as it is only a short distance from the City-road, 2726–2737——Admission that it would be perfectly fair for the authorities to carry out dispossession if they showed that there were sufficient vacant houses within a reasonable distance, 2738–2740.

Holborn District. Reduced overcrowding in Holborn district, *Gibbon* 1742——Several improvement schemes put forward in the district which have been rejected by the Metropolitan Board, a very good scheme having in the first instance been prepared by the officers of the Board but not adopted, *ib.* 1743-1751. 1809–1813——The Act of 1875 has not in fact been loyally carried out in the district by the Metropolitan Board; examination as to witness' grounds for this conclusion, *ib.* 1743. 1771–1808.

Admission as to the Metropolitan Board having carried out the Act of 1875, but not in a loyal spirit; mistake also in their adopting the plans of Mr. Vigers instead of those of their own officers, *Gibbon* 1771–1808——All the new artizans' buildings in the district are quite full, *ib.* 1826——Absence of empty houses for artizans in the district, *ib.* 1847—— Strong objection of the local authority for Holborn to ask for a rate for the erection of improved dwellings, *ib.* 1851–1857.

Re-construction by private individuals of houses demolished by the local authority; erection also of some new buildings through the land having been given by the Metropolitan Board almost for nothing, *Gibbon* 1856, 1858-1860.

Holborn Viaduct. Information in connection with the displacement of working classes by the Holborn Viaduct, and the limited provision compulsorily made for their accommodation in new buildings, *Gibbon* 1861–1877.

Holloway. Explanation in connection with a project for erecting buildings at Holloway near the Cattle Market; reference hereon to the number and class of houses recently put on the adjoining land, *Ashby* 59–61. 82. 115–125.

Home Office. See *Secretary of State* (*Home Department*).

Hoxton. Information in connection with the transit facilities for working men to and from Hoxton, *Hodson* 2726–2737.

Hunt,

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Hunt, Sir Henry Arthur, C.B. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long and extensive experience of witness as a surveyor; he has been in practice for fifty-two years, has been consulting surveyor to the Office of Works for twenty-six years, and has acted as arbitrator in fifteen schemes under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act of 1875; 173–183.

Opinion that the Act has worked most beneficially in the public interest, but that the machinery of the Act is too cumbrous, too dilatory, and too expensive, 184. 192——Paper submitted showing the date of appointment of witness in the different schemes, the date of publication of his provisional and final awards, the aggregate sums awarded in respect of each scheme, and the costs, 185.

Occupation of about twelve months by the Whitechapel scheme; delay of about three months in this case through the modification of the scheme, 186-188——Single instance in the case of Wolverhampton of any exception having been taken to witness' charges as arbitrator; appeal in this case to the Local Government Board, who decided that they had no jurisdiction, after which the charges were paid in full, 188. 191——Grounds for the suggestion that in future the arbitrator's charges should beyond doubt be supervised by the confirming authority under the Act, 188–191.

Heavy cost and unavoidable loss to the ratepayers in the clearance of unhealthy areas, 192——Proposition that as Parliament by the Act of 1875, amended by the Act of 1879, has sanctioned the principle of clearing away plague spots and unhealthy districts, any objections to schemes will be sufficiently considered by the confirming authority, or may be settled by some other means, without the necessity of an application to Parliament in each case, 192–198——Simplification of procedure and reduction of loss if the foregoing proposal be adopted, 192–198. 327, 328.

Explanation that the simplified procedure suggested by witness is taken from the Post Office (Land) Act of 1881, except that in the latter case the Provisional Order has to be confirmed by Act of Parliament; delay and expense on the latter score, 192. 195–197——Outline of the proceedings proposed when the local authority has received power to proceed with any scheme; any claimant electing to go before the standing arbitrator, instead of before a jury, must abide by the result without any appeal whatever, 197–199.

Proposal that if claimants neglect or refuse to go before the arbitrator, the latter should be empowered to proceed *ex parte*, and make his award, without any power of appeal; reference hereon to the course pursued in the Birmingham case, 198, 199——Advantage of the amended practice suggested by witness in connection with the notice to treat; check upon further expenditure, after receipt of the notice, with a view to increased compensation, 200——Under witness' scheme the arbitrator would make only one award, which should be final, there being no longer any provisional award, 201, 202.

Small difference between the aggregate of witness' provisional awards and the final awards, 203, 204——Total of only six cases in which there have been appeals to a jury, out of all the schemes of the Metropolitan Board of Works; amount of the claim, of the award, and of the verdict of the jury in each case, 204-210——Several appeals to a jury under the Birmingham scheme, 213.

Sufficiency of nine or ten months for the completion of schemes, up to the publication of the final award, if confirmation by Parliament be dispensed with; about two years are now necessary, 214, 215——Grounds for the suggestion that as regards claims under the Act of 1875, the 92nd section of the Lands Clauses Act should have no effect, and owners should not have power to claim for the whole of their property if only a part was wanted, 216–220.

Explanation of the action of witness as arbitrator in allowing compensation for trades; legal opinions taken on this point, 220-223——Suggestion whether in any revision of the Act a local authority taking proceedings under it should not be bound with as much dispatch as possible to compensate everybody who has an interest, 223.

Improvement if the initiative under Mr. Torrens' Acts were taken by the Metropolitan Board instead of by the vestries, the former doing all their work very well, 224, 225——Great care taken by witness in his arbitrations, both sides being duly heard, and the present condition and letting value of the property being fully considered in his awards, so that he may not be too liberal in his compensations, 226-228——Allowance merely of the value of the land and materials where the houses are so dilapidated and unsanitary as to be past repair, 226——Illustration in the case of the Whitechapel scheme of the reduced compensation awarded in view of the dilapidated condition of the property; total of about 10*s.* per foot awarded for land and houses in this instance, 227.

Avoidance of great loss to the ratepayers if the Whitechapel and similar properties could have been dealt with commercially, 227——Statement as to witness not having yet acted under the amended Act of 1879, though in the Little Coram-street scheme the third

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Hunt, Sir Henry Arthur, C.B. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

section will be applied; he has already formed his opinion as to the proper interpretations of this clause, 229-232.

Explanation as to the course pursued by witness in dealing with weekly tenants; conclusion as to the fair claim of these to compensation, especially where the occupation has extended over many years, 233, 234. 389-396——Circumstances under which, at Liverpool, witness adopted the plan of compensating weekly tenants at the rate of 1 *l.* for every year of tenancy, the aggregate in each case not to exceed 15 *l.*; he has followed this plan in every subsequent scheme, 233. 389-391.

Great demand for empty rooms in the Petticoat-lane district; system of tenant-right in operation, 233, 234——Very dense population and very large trade in this locality, 234——Practice of witness to invariably give compensation to weekly tenants in respect of property taken for railway companies; large sum also given to this class in respect of the property taken for the Courts of Justice, 234-237.

Particulars relative to the course pursued by witness in the taxation of costs; disallowance under different circumstances, 238-244——Adoption of Ryde's scale as regards the fees or costs of surveyors; recognition of this scale by the Court of Chancery, 238-240——Letter from witness' solicitor, Mr. Winckworth, as to the principles to be carried out by witness in the taxation of costs, and as to the difference of practice between him and Mr. Rodwell, 240, 241.

Opinion that the Metropolitan Board should have been authorised to put up a block of buildings themselves, under proper restrictions, so as to obtain experience as to the class of persons to be accommodated when slums are cleared, 247. 257-264——Information relative to the operations of the Victoria Dwellings Association, the number and class of tenants, rents paid, &c., 247-255.

Suggestion made by witness in 1870, when giving evidence before the Select Committee on Local Taxation, that barrack-buildings at a small rent should be provided for working men below the artizan class, where they should have the use of a common washhouse and a common kitchen, 256——Conclusion as to the expediency of power in the local authority or Metropolitan Board to erect blocks of buildings on a cheap plan in different parts of the metropolis for the lower class of working men; this power should not be restricted to sites acquired under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, 256-264.

Less difficulty doubtless in carrying out the Acts if the cost of acquiring sites were lessened, and if the payment received for the sites were increased, 266-270——Examination as to the extent to which witness agrees with certain evidence of Mr. Vigers relative to the value of the sites bought by the Peabody trustees as compared with the price paid by the trustees, 271-291——Considerable loss by the ratepayers if the ground rent of the sites have been sold to the trustees at only twenty years' purchase; fairness rather of twenty-seven years' purchase under certain conditions, 292-302.

Consideration of objections to the proposal for empowering the Metropolitan Board to erect dwellings for artizans, in order that the Board might know to what extent they could impose restrictions on other land to be let for similar purposes, 302-307——Effect of the present restrictions in deterring offers for the cleared areas, 308——Examination as to the probable operation of the relaxation whereby the buildings are to be maintained as artizans' dwellings for only ten years instead of eighty years; question more especially as to the facilities and cost of conversion of the buildings into warehouses or shops, 309-326.

Further statement as to witness' practice in allowing only the value of the land and materials when the property is insanitary and thoroughly bad, 329-331. 336-347——Beneficial operation of Mr. Torrens' Acts in empowering the local authorities to enforce the repair of bad property, 332——Probability of witness having given a higher compensation to weekly tenants than Mr. Rodwell gave, 333.

Opinion that the same principle should be observed under the Amendment Act of 1879 as under the original Act in the compensation of weekly tenants, 334——Rejection of agreements by witness whenever he had reason to believe they were manufactured for the sake of compensation, 335.

Explanation with further reference to the practice of witness in awarding compensation for loss of trade; question raised in Birmingham and Wolverhampton as to there being any claim on this score, 348-353——Compensation for length of tenancy further adverted to, witness repeating that 15 *l.* is the maximum awarded, it resting with the local authorities to carry out the award or to oppose it, 354-359. 389-391.

Doubt as to there being any legal authority under the Act for the award of compensation to weekly tenants, 360, 361——Improbability of its paying to convert to other purposes at the end of ten years houses built expressly for workmen, 362-366——Approval of the local authorities generally having power to provide dwellings for the lower

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Hunt, Sir Henry Arthur, C.B. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

lower class of working men, the wants varying greatly in different localities, 367, 368.

Further particulars in connection with the buildings of the Victoria Dwellings Company (as at Stroud Vale), the rents charged, and the class of people who are occupiers, 369-374——Facility under the Post Office Land Act of 1881 in obtaining sites, as the owners can be taken before a jury, 375-379——Prospect of appeals decreasing as the principle of arbitration is better understood; hitherto this has not been the result in witness' experience, 380-383.

Advantage of a variety of arbitrators rather than of one or two standing arbitrators, 383——Limited extent to which witness found there had been sales of the worst class of houses, as affording any criterion of their value, 384-387—— Dissent from Mr. Rodwell's practice in not giving any compensation in respect of small trades, 392, 393——Decided disapproval also of Mr. Rodwell's suggestion that a small uniform sum should be given to weekly tenants irrespectively of the period of their tenancy, 394-396.

[Second Examination.]—Explanation that in assenting to the proposition that twenty-seven years' purchase of ground rents is a fair price in certain cases, witness wishes to exclude sales of sites to the Peabody trustees, the price really depending on the covenants and restrictions in the contract, 397——Statement showing that there have been only two appeals in the Golden-lane scheme, though the amount involved in this scheme is 213,000*l.*; 397.

Approval of the appealable limit being 500*l.* rather than 1,000*l.*; under witness' scheme it would not be necessary to fix any sum as there should be no appeal from the jury or from the arbitrator, 398, 399. 460-462——Expediency of giving power to the Metropolitan Board and to the Commissioners of Sewers, but not to the arbitrators, to close very bad and insanitary houses; contemplated appeal in these cases, 400-406.

Further statement in favour of doing away with the provisional award, witness entirely dissenting from Mr. Rodwell's suggestions as to the alternative course to be pursued, 407-419——Numerous cases now settled between the claimants and the Metropolitan Board without coming before the arbitrator or going to a jury; check by means of costs if unreasonable claims are afterwards taken before the arbitrator, 411-417. 446-453——Objection to the arbitrator being informed what the Board were prepared to give, 411, 412. 414. 418, 419.

Extensive discretion exercised by witness under the Act in the disallowance of costs to owners, 420-423 —— Further particulars as to the practice generally of witness in respect of costs; dissent from certain evidence of Mr. Rodwell on the subject, 424-448 ——Reference to the Whitechapel scheme in illustration of the large excess of claims sent in as compared with the amount awarded by witness, 426-429.

Several matters allowed by witness as fairly coming under charge for costs, such as the preparation of claims; due care taken in the disallowance of improper charges, 429-439—— Allowance of Ryde's scale in nearly all cases where witness has considered a surveyor to be necessary, 440-445—— Opinion that the costs should go against the claimant whenever he is awarded less by the arbitrator than has been offered by the local authority, 449-453.

Reference to the class and number of cases to be dealt with by a jury under witness' scheme as adding somewhat to the expense of working the Act; large saving of expense on the other hand by doing away with appeals, 454-462——Conclusion that on the whole expense would be saved under witness' scheme, 459.

Further consideration of the amounts awarded by witness as compensation for loss of trade, on the ground that it was only just to give such compensation, though a legal opinion was obtained to the effect that it was not prescribed by the Act; doubt as to the enhanced expense thus incurred, 463-476——Probable reduction of trade compensation if the Metropolitan Board were empowered to build some houses on part of the condemned area, which might be offered to the people engaged in trade, 476-479.

Belief that if witness' awards had been made under the Act of 1879 instead of the earlier Act, the amounts would have been much the same as those which he has given, 480-482—— Several matters taken into account by witness in estimating the value of reversioners' property, 483-486.

Various circumstances taken into consideration in assessing the compensation to be awarded in respect of trade or business; no reliance is ever placed on income tax receipts, 487-492 —— Award of 93,300*l.* in respect of 153,000*l.* claimed in the Whitechapel case, the final award having been 130,000*l.*; 493-495.

Further explanations in connection with the proposal that the Metropolitan Board should have considerable powers in the erection of barracks for the accommodation not only of those displaced from condemned areas but of the poorer classes generally, 496-

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Hunt, Sir Henry Arthur, C.B. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

502——Pressing want of receptacles better than the workhouse for the casual poor, where a bed can be had for 3 *d.* or 4 *d.*; belief that the ratepayers would save money thereby, 500. 502.

Suggested discretion in the jury or in the arbitrator as to the allowance of 10 per cent.; undue stringency of the Act on this point, 502–504.

Hunt, Sir H. A., C.B. Paper submitted by Sir Henry Hunt containing particulars in connection with each of the schemes dealt with by him as arbitrator, *App.* 197.

Huntingdon Dwellings (*Bethnal Green Road*). Strong approval of the accommodation in these dwellings, *Abrey* 2590. 2627, 2628.

I.

Improved Dwellings (*Generally*). Important influence of improved dwellings upon the moral, social, and intellectual advancement of the people, *Goddard* 612——Great difficulty in overcoming the repugnance of the lower classes to live in improved dwellings, *ib.* 1637.

Bad effect, social and politically, through the poorer classes not being properly cared for as regards their dwellings, *Gilbert* 1189. 1197, 1198——Importance doubtless of healthy dwellings; still great importance of sufficient food and clothing, *ib.* 1298, 1299.

Opinion of the Committee that nothing will contribute more to the social, moral, and physical improvement of the working classes than the improvement of the houses in which they live, *Rep.* iii.

See also *Displacement and Replacement of Population. Peabody Trust. Victoria Dwellings Association.*

Improved Industrial Dwellings. Objections made by people to the rules of the industrial dwellings in Clerkenwell when they first read them; contented character of the people when they come to live in them, *Rose* 2460–2463——The only objection to these dwellings is that the rents are too high for men with small wages and large families, *ib.* 2464, 2465.

Strong opinion in favour of the buildings of the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company for men with families, witness having lived for several years in one of these buildings; complete privacy enjoyed by the tenants, *Hodson* 2651, 2652. 2654, 2655. 2696–2699. 2711–2722——Entire absence of restriction on the liberty of the tenants, *ib.* 2651.

Improvement Schemes. See *Cost. Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts. Schemes. Sites.*

Income Tax Receipts. No reliance is ever placed by witness on income tax receipts in dealing with claims for compensation, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 487–489——Comment upon income tax receipts as evidence of trade profits; result of information given by witness on this subject to Government, *Goddard* 588.

Insanitary Houses. See *Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses.*

Islington (*Essex Road Scheme*). Progress made with the Essex-road scheme, and with the High-street scheme, 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148——Instances of claims under the Essex-road scheme; great difference between the original claims and the amounts given by the jury, *ib.* 529, 530.

Statement showing for the High-street scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

Return showing the original estimate for the High-street scheme, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken for the Essex-road and High-street schemes, respectively, the gross cost by per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

J.

Jamaica Road. Considerable excess of accommodation provided in respect of the clearance in Jamaica-road, *Goddard* 1610.

Juries. Proposal as to parties having the option to go before a jury or before the arbitrator, and as to there being no appeal in such case from the decision of the arbitrator, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 197–199.

Approval of claimants going before the arbitrator alone, instead of their having the option of going first to a jury, *Goddard* 659–664——More expensive proceedings before arbitrators; probability of fairer compensation awards by the latter, *ib.* 662.

See also *Appeals.*

K.

Keating, William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness is a silver plater and has resided in Newport Market for eight years; he and his son are in the same employment in the neighbourhood of their home, 2026–2032. 2070, 2071. 2143–2145.

Great advantage in living close to the place of work; experiment tried by witness of living at Camberwell for a short time, 2033–2040. 2131–2133. 2137–2142——Inconvenience felt at Camberwell in respect of trams and workmen's trains in getting to work in the mornings; objection on account of the impossibility of getting home to dinner, 2036–2039. 2090–2097. 2170–2175.

Statement that the feeling of the inhabitants of Newport Market is entirely against pulling down the old houses before accommodation is provided for the people who are turned out, 2041–2043. 2045, 2046. 2068——Considerable overcrowding which results from the demolition of the old houses without the provision of house-room for those displaced; strong necessity for some action to alleviate the misery of the poorer population of London, 2043, 2044. 2109–2115. 2151–2156.

Decided objection to the Peabody and to the Waterlow Buildings on account of the restrictions imposed on the tenants; in these establishments there is an entire absence of the feeling of home, 2047–2052. 2178–2182——Unsuitability of the Peabody Buildings for tenants of the costermonger class; impossibility for costermongers to live in the suburbs on account of being far from their business, 2054–2065. 2069. 2072–2078. 2083–2086——Difficulties of accommodating costermongers in the Peabody Buildings on account of the want of a sufficient water supply; absolute necessity of having buildings in the centre of the town specially for these people, 2055, 2056. 2064, 2065. 2069. 2098–2102.

Absence of any system of Government inspection of private houses in regard to overcrowding, such inspection being confined to public lodging-houses, 2066, 2067. 2104–2108——Opinion that, on the score of health, there is not much advantage in living in the suburbs: belief that in many cases the advantage of sleeping in the fresh air is lost by having often to sit in wet clothes the whole of the day, 2087–2090. 2127–2129——Considerable rise in the price of lodgings outside the model buildings on account of the general overcrowding, 2103.

Statement that the district about Peckham and Camberwell has considerably deteriorated by the outflow from the centre of the town caused by the displacement of the inhabitants, 2116–2119. 2176, 2177——Desirability of building the houses in the suburbs higher than they are, and so accommodating double the number of people, 2120–2126.

Strong disapproval of the wife having to go out to work as well as the husband, 2146–2150——Great advantage to the children when the father goes home in the daytime to a regular meal, 2160, 2161——Statement that eighteen persons are living in the same house as witness, in six rooms, 2162–2168——Disinclination of witness to go to Plumstead to live, notwithstanding that there are many unoccupied comfortable houses for artizans, 2185.

Kirkham, Joseph Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a painter, working for Mr. Groombridge of Conduit-street, and resides at 12, Liehfield-street, Soho; also works as a dresser at the Haymarket Theatre at night, 2186–2193. 2226–2236——Has a family of eight children, two of whom are old enough to work for themselves, 2193–2196.

Circumstances under which witness went to reside at Battersea but returned to town after four months; the rents were lower than in town for the same accommodation, 2197–2202. 2209–2213——The prineipal objection to residing in the suburbs is the impossibilty

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Kirkham, Joseph Charles. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

for workmen to return home to meals, 2204-2208——Great difficulty in getting rooms in Soho, especially in the case of men with families, 2210-2212. 2256-2260——Increased rents in Soho at the present time, caused by the overcrowding consequent on the houses being pulled down, 2210-2212——Impossibility for men with families and low wages to reside in the suburbs, 2214, 2215. 2243-2248.

Suggestions in regard to the propriety of providing for the accommodation of the people before they are displaced by the demolition of the old houses, 2216-2223——Statement that the lodging-houses are more overcrowded at the present time, and the rents higher, than was the case ten or a dozen years ago, 2254.

L.

Lands Clauses Act. Grounds for the suggestion that as regards claims under the Act of 1875, the 92nd section of the Lands Clauses Act should have no effect, and owners should not have power to claim for the whole of their property if only a part was wanted, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 216-220 —— Frequency of excessive compensation under the Lands Clauses Act of 1845 in cases of street improvement, *Goddard* 513.

Law Courts. Statement as to witness having when in Mr. George Pownall's office settled with all the weekly tenants on the site for the new law courts, *Walker* 975, 976—— Particulars relative to the mode of settling with these tenants, and the discretion exercised by witness in giving sums of from 1 *l.* to 10 *l.* as compensation, after a week's notice, *ib.* 977-983. 1023-1028——Total of 834 families displaced on this site, the sum paid by witness amounting to 3,249 *l.*, *ib.* 979.

Readiness with which the people removed without complaint; various parts of the metropolis to which they went, *Walker* 980-985. 1025-1031. 1038, 1039. 1102-1106—— List of the different trades of the persons displaced, *ib.* 985-990——Particulars as to the time taken in the removal of the tenants from this site; absence of hardship in this respect, the people readily finding accommodation elsewhere, *ib.* 998-1009——Varying length of residence of the tenants, *ib.* 1045, 1046.

Leases. Belief as to much fraud being practised in connection with leases when excessive claims are being supported, *Goddard* 639, 640.—*See* also *Compensation.*

Lending Libraries. Reasons for believing that lending libraries in the industrial dwellings would not be entirely successful; disinclination of workmen of a certain class, such as watchmakers, to read in their spare time, *Hodson* 2708-2710——Instance in an existing lending library where the books remain on the shelves and are very rarely used, *ib.* 2710.

Limehouse. See *Whitechapel and Limehouse.*

Lincoln-court, Drury-lane. Instance of some property in Lincoln-court in a horribly insanitary state; excessive compensation awarded by the arbitrator in this case, *Goddard* 517. 589-594.

Little Coram-street. Progress made with this scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148——Statement showing the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

LIVERPOOL:

Circumstances under which at Liverpool witness adopted the plan of compensation of weekly tenants at the rate of 1 *l.* for every year of tenancy, the aggregate in each case not to exceed 15 *l.*; he has followed this plan in every subsequent scheme, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 233. 389-391.

Information respecting the only scheme which has been undertaken in Liverpool under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; application made to the Local Government Board for a modification of the original scheme, which could not be carried out through inability to find a purchaser for the ground, *Rayner* 3449-3453. 3475-3485. 3523-3532—— Statement as to the estimated cost of the new street across Nash grove; satisfactory result in so far as the actual expenditure amounted only to half the estimate, *ib.* 3451-3453. 3495-3502.

Rapidity with which the scheme of the new street was carried out under the Act of 1875; belief that it would have taken from two to three years to complete if the property had been taken under the Lands Clauses Act, *Rayner* 3452-3456——Satisfactory manner in which the arbitration in regard to the value of the property purchased for the new street was carried out by Sir Henry Hunt; single case of appeal against his decision, *ib.* 3455. 3457-3474. 3507-3515. 3602-3607——Statement that the general process

Report, 1882—*continued.*

LIVERPOOL—continued.

process of building in Liverpool provided ample accommodation for the people who had been displaced by the new street; no necessity therefore for the corporation to make any efforts to provide habitations, *Rayner* 3485-3492. 3567. 3573. 3577. 3598-3601. 3617.

Proposal made for the erection of a fish market on the ground which the Liverpool Corporation have been unable to sell, *Rayner* 3494. 3608-3614——The numbers to be displaced under the Nash Grove scheme would be about 200 families consisting of 1,100 persons, *ib.* 3516-3518——Local powers in Liverpool under the Sanitary Amendment Act of 1864 of dealing with premises which are unfit for human habitation; 100,000*l.* spent by the Liverpool Corporation in effecting improvements under this Act, *ib.* 3533-3541. 3544-3553. 3580-3584. 3589-3592.

Liberal treatment by Sir Henry Hunt of the weekly tenants who were displaced by the new street, *Rayner* 2574——Explanation that in Liverpool there is more overcrowding of houses than there is overcrowding of families in each house, *ib.* 3575, 3576——Absence of inconvenience to the working man in Liverpool in being removed from the vicinity of his work, *ib.* 3576, 3577.

Compensation granted by Sir Henry Hunt in the case of insanitary dwellings which had to be pulled down, to the extent of twelve years' purchase on the next rental, *Rayner* 3585, 3586——Non-success of the building scheme entered into by the Liverpool Corporation under the Act of 1868, *ib.* 3593-3597——Absence of any local dissatisfaction through Sir Henry Hunt, a London man, having been appointed as arbitrator, *ib.* 3603-3607——Facility of removing the artizans to places within a mile or so of Liverpool if it were necessary to displace them by demolishing insanitary dwellings, *ib.* 3618-3620.

Particulars in connection with the award of Sir Henry Hunt in the Nash Grove scheme, *App.* 197.

Paper handed in by Mr. Rayner showing the conditions of sale in the application of the Act of 1875, *App.* 227-229.

Paper containing particulars in connection with list of objections to the provisional award of Sir Henry Hunt, *App.* 230, 231.

Local Authorities. Approval of the local authorities generally having power to provide dwellings for the lower class of working men, the wants varying greatly in different localities, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 256-264. 367, 368.

Comment upon the action of the local authorities in putting pressure upon the Metropolitan Board as to the repair of dilapidated houses of which they have become owners, and which they intend soon to remove, *Goddard* 572-574——Obstacle to the application of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts in cases where only a few houses are to be dealt with; action left to the vestries in these cases, *ib.* 578-582——Opinion that much more might have been done by the vestries in the improvement of slums, *ib.* 636-638.

Default of the parish authorities owing to which the necessity for the Artizans' Dwellings Acts has mainly arisen, *Walker* 1149——Means of the local authorities, as in the Bethnal Green district, for providing four-storeyed buildings at cheap rates, concurrently with the removal of slums, *Gilbert* 1341-1350——Distinct duties of the vestries and of the district surveyors in respect of drainage and buildings, respectively, *Tripe* 1958-1964. 2017-2020.

Great value attached to any assistance which the local authority may render in finding accommodation elsewhere for the persons displaced, *Rep.* viii.

See also *Torrens' Acts.*

London Trades' Council. Detailed statement on the part of the London Trades' Council relative to the provisions and operation of the Act of 1875, and the amended regulations desirable on various points, *Powell* 2488-2491.

Evidence in detail in support of the representations and suggestions submitted by Mr. Powell on the part of the council, *Abrey* 2579 *et seq.*

Paper handed in by Mr. Powell showing the names of societies, and the number of members comprised in each, *App.* 219.

M.

Market Value (*Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses*). Great difficulty in arriving at the market value, *Goddard* 513——Average of not more than ten years' purchase on the net rental realised by private sales of freehold property in narrow courts and alleys, *Walker* 1032-1034. 1054-1064——Increased outlay necessary beyond ten years' purchase, for bad freehold property, where there are middlemen to be dealt with, *ib.* 1057-1064.

Correction of former statement as to the price realised by poor freehold property, the amount being 14 or 15 per cent., and being about 10 per cent. for the leasehold, *Walker* 1124, 1125.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Markets. Importance of marketing facilities as an element for consideration in the clearance of any large area in the metropolis; several cheap markets all over the metropolis, *Walker* 1078-1084——Great facilities to working men as regards cheap markets by living in London instead of in the suburbs, *Gilbert* 1188.

Importance of the question of proximity to markets in connection with the re-housing of the people displaced when areas are cleared, *Rep.* ix.

Marylebone. Progress made with the Bowman's Building scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148.

Argument that in Marylebone the people must be treated differently from those in Whitechapel, as there are in the former a class of employers who require local labour; great evils which result from the separation of class from class, *Miss Hill* 3248. 3262. 3294–3305. 3324-3327.

Examination in regard to the particular areas in the Marylebone district which should be entirely demolished, or which might be dealt with under Mr. Torrens' Act; importance of the work of demolition being done gradually, *Miss Hill* 3263–3273. 3312, 3313. 3329-3331.

Information relative to some property in which witness is interested, amounting to 60,000 *l.*; introduction of a system of co-operation by which the tenants benefit in return for the care bestowed by them upon the houses in which they live, *Miss Hill* 2977–2982. 3306-3311. 3318. 3355-3359. 3431-3437——Lower class of tenants in witness' improved dwellings than the Peabody Buildings and the industrial dwellings, *ib.* 3319-3323——Belief that in no part of London is there such good accommodation for the poor as in Marylebone; desire on the part of many who have left to return, *ib.* 3326.

Statement showing the original estimate for the Bowman's Buildings scheme, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board, and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Paper showing the total area taken under the scheme, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Medical Officers. Advantage if the local medical officers were appointed by the Home Secretary, instead of by the vestries; difficulty at present in their being independent of vestrymen who hold bad property, *Goddard* 576, 577. 637.

Metropolitan Board of Works:

1. *Action generally of the Board under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; Progress made with the several Schemes.*
2. *Question of the Board providing Buildings for the Lower Classes displaced by Improvement Schemes.*

1. *Action generally of the Board under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; Progress made with the several Schemes:*

Limited success of the Metropolitan Board in letting the areas cleared by them; that is, much of their land is still in hand, *Ashby* 36, 37. 99–101.

Long and extensive experience of witness as chief surveyor and valuer to the Metropolitan Board; aggregate of about 7,000,000 *l.* as the value of the properties respecting which he has advised the Board, *Goddard* 139, 140.

Summary of the steps taken by the Board consequent on the interim Report of the Select Committee of last Session, dated 2nd August; progress since made in the clearance of the several areas, *Goddard* 141–143.

Particulars relative to the position of the Board and the progress made, as on the 1st March 1882, in respect of the several artizans' schemes for which Provisional Orders have been obtained; total of fourteen schemes taken in hand, *Goddard* 146–148.

Further explanation as to the extensive professional experience of witness; he has advised the Board upon the purchase of the various properties included in the schemes under the Act of 1875, *Goddard* 505–509——Vast amount of care bestowed by the Chairman and other members of the Metropolitan Board, as well as by witness and other officers, upon the several schemes under the Acts of 1875 and 1879, *ib.* 531.

Insufficiency of a period of nine months after the final award has been given, within which the entire matter should be completed by the Board, and the land thrown open for public use, *Goddard* 583——Explanation as to the number of abstracts sent weekly into the office of the Board, *ib.* 583. 669, 670.

2. *Question of the Board providing Buildings for the Lower Classes displaced by Improvement Scemes:*

Opinion that the Metropolitan Board should have been authorised to put up a block of buildings themselves, under proper restrictions, so as to obtain experience as to the class of

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Metropolitan Board of Works—continued.

2. *Question of the Board providing Buildings, &c.*—continued.

of persons to be accommodated when slums are cleared, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 247. 257–264 —— Conclusion as to the expediency of power in the local authority or Metropolitan Board to erect blocks of buildings on a cheap plan in different parts of the metropolis for the lower class of working men; this power should not be restricted to sites acquired under the Artizans' Dwellings, *ib.* 256–264.

Consideration of objections to the proposal for empowering the Board to erect dwellings for artizans, in order that the Board might know to what extent they could impose restrictions on other land to be let for similar purposes, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 302–307.

Grounds for the opinion that the Board might advantageously provide model lodging houses of a more plain and less luxurious character than the Peabody Buildings or the improved industrial dwellings, for the accommodation of the lower classes displaced by schemes under the Acts of 1875 and 1879, *Goddard* 598*–600——Calculation that subject to the original loss on the cleared areas buildings provided by the Board would return a profit of from 4 to 5 per cent., *ib.* 601–605.

Further statement upon the question of the Board being empowered to build; careful calculation made in 1875 as to the financial result, *Goddard* 696–703.

Approval of the cleared sites being first offered to public companies by auction, and of its being compulsory upon the Board to provide the new buildings if others do not come forward to do so, *Walker* 1116–1120——Inexpediency of putting the Board in competition with private enterprise in the provision of improved dwellings, *ib.* 1121–1123.

Expediency of the Metropolitan Board being bound to provide cheap accommodation for those displaced by their improvements, *Gilbert* 1195–1198 1220–1226——Further suggestions as to the price or cost at which the Board should provide dwellings for the people displaced by their improvement operations; equitable obligation upon the Board to do something for those whose interests they have injured, *ib.* 1288–1299——Reference to the operation generally of the Acts of 1868 and 1875, witness further submitting that it should be obligatory upon the Metropolitan Board to provide cheap and suitable lodgings in any district where the houses of the poor are destroyed by improvements, *ib.* 1330 1335.

Questionable expediency in the poorer ratepayers being taxed for the purpose of the erection of dwellings to be occupied by artizans of a higher class, *Goddard* 1615—— Objection to the Board engaging in building operations, *Gibbon* 1822. 1857.

See also *Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879. *Compensation. Cost. Displacement and Replacement of Population. Gray's Inn-road. Holborn District. Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts. Peabody Trust*, 2. *Schemes. Sites. Torrens' Acts. Western Improvements Scheme.*

Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts (1872 *and* 1877):

Statement as to the prejudicial effect upon the value of cleared areas under the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act of 1872, by the obligation to allocate them in perpetuity as sites for labourers' dwellings, *Reid* 891–894——Prejudicial effect also of the arbitration clause of the Act of 1872, *ib.* 893.

Examination in support of the conclusion that the Metropolitan Board are unduly fettered by the 33rd section of the Street Improvements Act of 1877, and are prevented thereby from carrying out their Western-street improvements; suggestions for modifying the restrictions in question, *Reid* 895 *et seq.*; 935–948.

Effect of certain provisions of the Street Improvements Act of 1872, in militating against the purchase of cleared sites for artizans' dwellings, *Walker* 1126–1130——Way in which the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 renders impracticable the completion of certain improvements of the Board; that is, through the difficulty of obtaining sites within a reasonable distance, *ib.* 1131–1139. 1142–1147——Conclusion as to the expediency of repeating or modifying the 33rd section of the Act of 1877, *ib.* 1133. 1142–1147. 1162–1173.

Exceeding stringency as regards the Board of the obligations imposed by Sections 48 and 49 of the Act of 1872; reference more especially to the requirement as to notices before fifteen houses can be taken in any parish, *Goddard* 1566–1578. 1612. 1672–1674 ——Advantage of the proviso whereby if the Board could not within three years let the sites for artizans' dwellings, they might sell them for commercial purposes; unwillingness of the Board to put this proviso in force, *ib.* 1573–1579. 1680–1683.

Grounds for complaint as to the operation of the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; great delay and difficulty through the proviso that the Board shall not remove fifteen

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts (1872 *and* 1887)—continued.

houses before they have provided adequate accommodation for the people displaced, *Goddard* 1574. 1580 *et seq.*

Further statement as to the importance generally of the Board being relieved from the restrictions in the 33rd section; reference hereon to communications from the Home Office in December 1879 and June 1880, as to the obligations upon the Board under this section, *Goddard* 1612–1616. 1631–1635. 1684–1691.

Reference to the Act of 1872 as first imposing any obligation upon the Board as to re-housing the labouring classes; witness makes no special complaint respecting the notice, &c., under this Act, *Goddard* 1630——Insufficiency of a modification as regards the non-removal of more than fifteen houses at a time by extending the number to fifty or sixty houses, *ib.* 1688–1691.

Decided opinion that the 33rd section of the Act of 1877 should either be totally abolished or greatly modified, *Gibbon* 1820–1822——Approval of a modification of the restrictions imposed by the 33rd clause in regard to the demolition of not more than fifteen houses, *Miss Stanley* 2849. 2858. 2964–2970.

Statement submitted by Mr. Goddard relative to the operation of the 33rd section of the Act of 1877, and showing the effect of various clauses in railway and other Acts upon the same subject, *App.* 216–218.

Circumstance of all the places to which the Act of 1872 applies having been already dealt with by the Metropolitan Board, no complaint now arising in respect thereof, *Rep.* xi.

Serious difficulties presented by the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; that is, in respect of the restriction against taking down more than fifteen houses at any one time, and also in respect of appropriating land for the purpose of providing accommodation for the whole of the people to be displaced, *Rep.* xii.

Suggestions for relaxing the provisions of the Act of 1877, and for the introduction of a Bill for this purpose during the present Session, *Rep.* xii, xiii——Relaxation suggested as to the number of houses to be taken down at any time, and as to the necessity of building to the extent provided by the Act, *ib.* xii——The relaxations proposed should be adopted in any future Metropolitan Street Improvement Act, *ib.* xiii.

See also *Gray's Inn-road.*

Middlemen. Great evil in the worst class of houses being held by middlemen who screw the tenants down to the last farthing, and do little or nothing for the property, *Goddard* 517.

Model Dwellings. Complaints as to the absence of home comforts in the model lodging-houses generally; exceptions where taste and convenience, together with the privacy of home, have been secured in some of the buildings erected more recently, *Powell* 2483–2487. 2491——Strong feeling of disappointment in the minds of the working classes as regards the block system of dwellings; settled prejudice against their barrack-like appearance, and the publicity of the system, *ib.* 2491.

Objection to the model dwellings as being too like barracks, and as having outside staircases, &c.; it is only as a last resource that these dwellings are inhabited, in consequence of people with families being unable to get houses elsewhere, *Evans* 2749, 2750. 2791–2794. 2804–2806.

Great advantage to the working men of the model dwellings which have been lately built; there are a few restrictions which are disliked only by those persons who have had no experience of them, *Miss Stanley* 2851–2853. 2866–2868. 2912–2915.

See also *Farringdon-road. Palmerston Buildings. Peabody Trust. Playgrounds. Shops.*

N.

Newport Market. Dishonest character of some of those affected by the Newport Market improvement; accommodation available in the Peabody Buildings in Westminster for people displaced by this improvement, *Goddard* 645–647 ——Great advantage probably in the case of the Newport Market site if the Metropolitan Board had authority to build; that is, with a view to providing for the very poor, *ib.* 702, 703——Importance of there being no delay in covering this site, so that the western improvements may be expedited, *ib.* 702——Illustration in the case of houses in Newport Market of exorbitant rents and accommodation, *Reid* 851.

Witness, who is a silver plater, has resided in Newport Market for eight years; he and his son are in the same employment in the neighbourhood of their home, *Keating* 2026–2032.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Newport Market—continued.

2026-2032. 2070, 2071. 2143-2145——Statement that the feeling of the inhabitants of Newport Market is entirely against pulling down the old houses before accommodation is provided for the people who are turned out, *Keating* 2041-2043. 2045, 2046. 2068——Eighteen persons are living in the same house as witness, in six rooms, *ib.* 2162-2168.

Night Refuges. Particulars relative to the assistance given to those in need by means of a night refuge founded by witness in the East End, *Gilbert* 1198-1202.

Northumberland-avenue. Statement showing the conditions of sale of land as regards approval of building plans, &c., by the Metropolitan Board, *Goddard* 583; *App.* 203——Enormous sacrifice if the Board were bound to accommodate the labouring classes on the Northumberland-avenue site, *Goddard* 1615.

Notice to Treat. Advantage of the amended practice suggested by witness in connection with the notice to treat; check upon further expenditure, after receipt of the notice, with a view to increased compensation, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 200.

O.

Occupations of Tenants. List of occupations of the tenants in Battersea Buildings and Stroud Vale Buildings (Victoria Dwellings Association), *App.* 198.

Statement showing the avocations of the tenants affected by the Sun-street to Worship-street improvement, *App.* 208-213.

List of occupations of tenants at George-yard Buildings in July 1881, *App.* 222.

List of occupations of tenants of certain houses in Wentworth-street and Angel-alley, *App.* 223.

Old Pye-street (*Westminster*). Progress made with this scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148——Sanction by the Secretary of State of a modification of the Old Pye-street scheme; the blocks will be ready for occupation about Midsummer 1882, *Crouch* 166.

Sufficient accommodation in the case of Pye-street, Westminster, for 600 persons in excess of the number dispossessed, *Goddard* 1581——Considerable accommodation to be provided in Old Pye-street, this being available in respect of the Western improvement scheme rather than as regards the Gray's Inn-lane improvement, *ib.* 1654-1657.

Statement showing for this scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

Paper showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the percentage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Overcrowding. Effect of the demolition of houses in causing overcrowding unless prompt action be taken, *Gibbon* 1899——Considerable overcrowding which results from the demolition of the old houses without the provision of house-room for those displaced; urgent necessity for some action to alleviate the misery of the poorer population of London in this respect, *Keating* 2043, 2044. 2109-2115. 2151-2156——Absence of any system of Government inspection of private houses in regard to overcrowding, such inspection being confined to public lodging-houses, *ib.* 2066, 2067. 2104-2108.

Demoralization which naturally comes with overcrowding of families in one or two rooms, *Rose* 2421-2426——Immense overcrowding which the late demolitions have caused in the neighbourhood of the Western improvement, *Miss Stanley* 2848-2850.

Increase of overcrowding if no fresh dwellings be provided for the people displaced, *Rep.* ix.

See also *Clerkenwell.*

Owners. Ownership of bad property chiefly by small tradesmen, *Goddard* 525——Instances in support of the conclusion that no sufficiently stringent law is enforced upon the owners of houses unfit for habitation, *ib.* 576.

Conclusion strongly adverse to the municipal authority being required or permitted to purchase house property which had become unfit for occupation by reason of age or of neglect on the part of the owners, *Grant* 739-741. 759-762——Expediency of the municipal authority being empowered to compel the owners of bad property to pull it down or to put it in repair, *ib.* 741. 759-762.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Owners—continued.

Proposition that the Metropolitan Board or some specially appointed authority should exercise a supervision over all houses let in lodgings to weekly tenants with a view to compelling the owners to keep them in proper sanitary repair, and to make the accommodation otherwise suitable, *Reid* 835-847.

Insanitary state of many of the houses in which the better class artizans live in London; explanation that this is often owing more to the landlords' neglect rather than to the bad state of the house itself, *Evans* 2820-2825.

Statement that bad courts are very good investments for usurers who get an enormous rental out of the very worst courts; objection on the part of these persons to sell such property unless legislative power is put into operation against them, *Miss Hill* 3285-3293. 3369-3371——Desire of witness that the property in which she is interested should be managed on a sound commercial basis, and pay a fair per-centage; no limit is placed on the wages of the people to whom the houses are let, *ib.* 3318, 3319. 3435-3437.

Disapproval of adopting the American plan known as the "betterment" clauses, by which the whole cost of improvement is charged upon the other owners, *Rayner* 3559-3564. 3587, 3588.

See also *Compensation.* *Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses.*

P.

Palmerston-buildings (*Goswell-road*). Excellent character of the Palmerston-buildings, the ground floor being used for shops; this plan might be adopted in the case of Gray's Inn-road, *Gibbon* 1900-1902——Decided approval of the accommodation and regulations in these buildings, *Hodson* 2651, 2652. 2654, 2655. 2696-2699. 2711-2722.

Peabody Trust:

1. *Progress being made by the Trustees in the Erection of Dwellings on the Sites purchased from the Metropolitan Board.*
2. *Consideration of the Terms on which Sites were Sold to the Trustees.*
3. *Character of the Accommodation; Respect in which unsuited to the Lower Grade of the Working Classes.*
4. *Rules and Restrictions.*
5. *Rents.*
6. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *Progress being made by the Trustees in the Erection of Dwellings on the Sites purchased from the Metropolitan Board:*

As secretary to the Peabody Trustees witness explains the progress made since last Midsummer with the various blocks of buildings and with the schemes not yet commenced upon, *Crouch* 164-169——The sanction of the Secretary of State has been applied for with a view to modifications of the Whitecross-street and Pear Tree-court schemes; otherwise there has been no delay, and it is expected that the whole of the areas will be covered with buildings by Midsummer 1883, *ib.* 166-172.

2. *Consideration of the Terms on which Sites were Sold to the Trustees:*

Examination as to the extent to which witness agrees with certain evidence of Mr. Vigers relative to the value of the sites bought by the Peabody trustees as compared with the price paid by the trustees, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 271-291——Considerable loss by the ratepayers if the ground rents of the sites had been sold to the trustees at only twenty years' purchase; fairness rather of twenty-seven years' purchase under certain conditions, *ib.* 292-302.

Explanation that in assenting to the proposition that twenty-seven years' purchase of ground rents is a fair price in certain cases, witness wishes to exclude sales of sites to the Peabody trustees, the price really depending on the covenants and restrictions in the contract, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 397.

Efforts of the Board to sell the Whitechapel and Limehouse area before their acceptance of the offer of the Peabody trustees for portion of this area and for five other sites at 3 *d.* per foot; belief that under the circumstances they have got the fair commercial value, *Goddard* 559-563.

Reference to a letter from Lord Derby (*App.* 202), chairman of the Peabody Trust, as showing that the Board had good reason for believing they could not get a higher price for the sites collectively, *Goddard* 559, 560.

Opinion that the price of 3 *d.* per foot, as paid by the Peabody trustees, is as fair and reasonable an average for the whole of the six sites as could be obtained under the circumstances, *Reid* 803.

3. *Character*

Report, 1882—*continued.*

PEABODY TRUST—continued.

3. *Character of the Accommodation; Respect in which unsuited to the Lower Grade of the Working Classes:*

Illustration of the objection of people displaced to remove into Peabody-buildings close by, *Goddard* 598——Use of the buildings by a much better class than are dispossessed by improvement schemes, *ib.* 599. 610-612——Circumstance of the Peabody-buildings or other improved dwellings not being really available for the inhabitants of the slums, *Reid* 805. 839.

Several classes for whom the Peabody-buildings are not suitable, there being no admission of these, *Gilbert* 1192. 1236. 1251-1253 — Continual complaint by the people that the Peabody trustees have not fulfilled their duties, and that the trust was intended for the benefit of the very poor, *ib.* 1278——Objection by many of the labouring poor, especially the Irish, not only to registered lodging-houses but to the Peabody Buildings, as not conducive to morality, *ib.* 1350, 1351.

Disapproval of the Peabody-buildings as being too prison-like, and as going too much on the barrack system, *Gibbon* 1896, 1897——Necessity for the erection of houses suitable for a poorer class than inhabit the existing buildings, *Field* 2301. 2305. 2307. 2360.

4. *Rules and Restrictions:*

Reluctance of the lower grade of the labouring classes to submit to the rules in the Peabody Buildings for the enforcement of cleanliness and order; great antagonism of these people to habits of cleanliness, *Goddard* 626-633——Objection of the people to the rules and restrictions in the Peabody Buildings, *Gilbert* 1373.

Decided objection to the Peabody and to the Waterlow Buildings on account of the restrictions imposed on the tenants; in these establishments there is an entire absence of the feeling of home, *Keating* 2047-2052. 2178-2182——Strong objection to the Peabody and the Waterlow Buildings on account of the unnecessary restrictions upon the tenants; opinion that a respectable reference is all that should be required from a tenant seeking accommodation, *Field* 2291-2294. 2301-2305. 2360, 2361. 2369-2374.

Statement that the rules of the Peabody trustees were formerly irksome, but of late years they have been very much modified, *Powell* 2569-2571——Unsuitability of the Peabody Buildings for the class of people living in Whitechapel on account of the restrictive rules; objection in these buildings to permit women to take in washing, *Barnett* 3081-3087. 3217-3226.

5. *Rents:*

The amount of rent in the Peabody Buildings is by no means prohibitory, *Goddard* 632.

Reference to the Peabody Buildings as beyond the price that the poor who are displaced can afford to pay; grounds for this statement, *Gilbert* 1189. 1195. 1203-1211. 1235, 1236. 1355. 1356. 1366. 1374-1377——Consideration of a statement as to the people displaced by certain improvements having been offered rooms at a low rent in the Peabody Buildings, and having gone elsewhere, *ib.* 1227-1236.

Further statement upon the question of the rents being too high in the Peabody Buildings for the poorer working classes, it being explained to witness that the average rent per room is only 1 *s.* 11½ *d.* per room, *Gilbert* 1254-1257——Witness repeats that it is essential to provide cheaper dwellings for the people than are now available in the Peabody Buildings, and suggests that the rents should be lowered by the trustees, and that part of the capital fund should be spent for this purpose, *ib.* 1264-1287.

6. *Conclusions of the Committee:*

Reference by the Committee to the buildings of the Peabody Trustees as being somewhat beyond the means, and unsuited to the wants and special callings, of the poorer class of persons occupying areas with which it has been necessary to deal under the Act of 1875, *Rep.* v.

Opinion of the Committee that the Peabody Trustees should specially undertake the duty of supplying the wants of the poorer class of persons displaced, *Rep.* x.

Hope expressed that the trustees may make provisions suited to the means and to the wants and special callings of a poorer class than that for which they have hitherto provided, *Rep.* x.

See also *Rents.*

Pear Tree Court (Clerkenwell). See *Clerkenwell.*.

Peckham See *Camberwell and Peckham.*

Petticoat Square Area. See *City of London.*

Plaster. Improvement if the Metropolitan Board had power over the plaster used in houses, as they have in the matter of concrete floors, *Tripe* 1924, 1925. 1940, 1941. 1966. 2016. 2035.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Playgrounds. Desirability of children's playgrounds in connection with model buildings; possibility of utilising the flat roofs of the buildings for this purpose, *Hodson* 2654, 2655. 2707. 2723-2725——Objection to the model dwellings on account of the absence of playgrounds for children; great danger to children in going up and down the staircases of these buildings, *Evans* 2791-2794. 2804-2814——Disadvantage in the Peabody Buildings that there are no playgrounds for the children, *Miss Stanley* 2852.

Suggestion by the Committee that in many cases the new buildings should be provided with playgrounds for children on the top of the roof or on the ground below, *Rep.* x.

Plumstead. Disinclination of witness to go from London to Plumstead to live, notwithstanding that there are many unoccupied comfortable houses for artizans in the latter locality, *Keating* 2185.

Population. Return showing the number of inhabited houses and the population in each of the years 1851, 1861, 1871, and 1881, in the City of London, in the Metropolitan police district (excluding the City), and in London within the limits of the Metropolis Local Management Act, *App.* 234.

Post Office (*Land*) *Act* (1881). Facility under the Post Office Land Act of 1881 in obtaining sites, as the owners can be taken before a jury; advantage of the simplified procedure under this Act, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 192. 195-197. 375-379.

Powell, Thomas Eckford. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is a bookbinder and represents the Machine Rulers' Society; has lived for twelve years in Raymouth-road, Jamaica Level, in a seven-roomed house, for which he pays 12 *s.* a week rent, 2466-2471.

Decided opinion that accommodation should be provided for artizans and labourers who are displaced by the demolition of their houses, 2472——Considerable inconvenience which is caused to the working men generally by being forced to live in the suburbs; extra cost of living by reason of the distance from the markets, 2472-2481. 2491, 2492. 2516-2518. 2520-2523——Complaints as to the absence of home comforts in the model lodging-houses generally; exceptions where taste and convenience, together with the privacy of home, have been secured in some of the buildings erected more recently, 2483-2487. 2491.

Detailed statement upon the working of the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act submitted by witness as the representative of the London Trades Council; special committee of the Trades Council elected to collect the opinions of their fellow-workmen, 2487-2491.

Existence of areas which should long ago have been cleared, as being dangerous to those dwelling in them, and to those around, 2491. 2542-2548——Strong feeling of disappointment in the minds of the working classes as regards the block system of dwellings; settled prejudice against their barrack-like appearance, and the publicity of the system, 2491.

Objection to the dwellings in question that the rents demanded represent a proportion of from 25 to 28 per cent. on the earnings of the working classes, whereas outside the proportion is only 20 per cent., 2491. 2528, 2529——Decided opinion that the State should acquire land compulsorily, if necessary, for the purposes of the Act; unfairness of the cost of the dwellings falling entirely upon the locality, 2491. 2493-2496. 2536-2541. 2549-2560. 2572-2574——Expediency of clearing the sites and constructing the buildings with the utmost rapidity, 2491. 2497-2501.

Statement in regard to the sanitary defects in the block system of dwellings; approval of stringent supervision on this point, 2491. 2555-2558——Suggestions in favour of erecting cottage homes in the suburbs within ten or twelve miles of Charing Cross; advantage of providing an equitable system of purchase to be grafted on the terms of tenancy, 2491. 2493. 2507-2512——Argument that as the ratepayers benefit by the demolition of houses, they might be fairly expected to contribute generally towards the cost of the new dwellings, 2250-2506.

Decided opinion that workmen should be carried by the railway companies at a charge of 1 *s.* a week for any distance up to ten or twelve miles; belief that such an arrangement would pay the companies; 2513-2515. 2561-2568——Desire upon the part of the working classes to become the owners of their own houses; disfavour in which the building societies are held by working men on account of the slowness of their operations, 2524-2527.

Great dearth of employment in London at the present time among the unskilled class of labourers, 2530-2535——Strong desire felt by the working classes that the State should assist those who take up the matter of the artizans' dwellings, by enabling them easily to acquire the land; advantage of this assistance, 2549-2554——Statement that the rules of the Peabody dwellings were formerly irksome, but that of late years they have been very much modified, 2569-2571.

Private

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Private Enterprise. Reliance to be placed on private enterprise for providing the required accommodation for the working classes, *Walker* 963——Suggestion that by way of premium on the erection of artizans' or labourers' dwellings by private individuals these places be exempted from taxation; failure, on the whole, of private enterprise to supply the want, *Gibbon* 1822, 1823. 1831–1835. 1848–1850——Necessity of some bonus as an inducement to private enterprise to erect artizans' dwellings, *ib.* 1877.

Impossibility of doing lasting good to the working people by small efforts of private individuals; necessity of action under an Act of Parliament, *Miss Stanley* 2879–2882. 2887–2897. 2907–2911.

Belief that private individuals can carry out the object of the Artizans' Dwelling Acts more economically than public bodies; instances in which four and five per cent. is not only paid, but a considerable amount is laid aside, *Miss Hill* 3240–3243. 3287. 3310. 3388–3393——Decided opinion that nothing effectual can be done to improve either the dwellings or the social status of the poor without volunteer work and actual personal supervision, *ib.* 3260. 3314–3323. 3359–3362. 3410–3418.

Ample room not only for the several Acts of Parliament with reference to improved dwellings for the working classes but for private enterprise as well, *Rep.* iii.

Provincial Towns. Grounds for the conclusion of the Committee that in provincial towns there is not the same necessity as in London for insisting on the rebuilding of houses for the classes displaced, *Rep.* ix——Recommended amendment of the Act of 1875, in order to relieve provincial towns from the obligation in question, *ib.*

Provisional Award. Under witness' scheme for an amended procedure the arbitrator would make only one award which should be final, there being no longer any provisional award, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 201, 202——Further statement in favour of doing away with the provisional award, witness entirely dissenting from Mr. Rodwell's suggestions as to the alternative course to be pursued, *ib.* 407–419.

Suggestion that the expense of working the Acts of 1875 and 1879 might be reduced by abolishing the provisional and final award, *Reid* 890.

Concurrence of the Committee in the recommendation made by several witnesses that the provisional award should be dispensed with, *Rep.* viii. xiii.

Provisional Order. Relaxation obtained by the Metropolitan Board from the Secretary of State of certain conditions in the Provisional Order which interfered with the letting of the land, *Goddard* 141.

Public-houses. Very large sums necessarily given by the Metropolitan Board for public-houses; instances to this effect, witness handing in a table on the subject, *Goddard* 547; *App.* 201.

R.

Railway Facilities (Working Classes). See *Great Eastern Railway. Workmen's Trains.*

Rates and Ratepayers. Argument that as the ratepayers benefit by the demolition of houses, they may be fairly expected to contribute generally towards the cost of the new dwellings, *Powell* 2502–2506——Large increase in the value of property where model dwellings have been erected; the rateable value of the property in Bethnal Green has increased as much as fourfold, *Miss Stanley* 2859. 2916–2926——Benefit to the ratepayers by the erection of improved dwellings, *Barnett* 3212–3215.

Statement showing the rateable value of the Metropolis and the City and the sums charged for artizans' dwellings by annual precept of the Metropolitan Board of Works, *Goddard* 3742–3753; *App.* 232.

Important gain to the ratepayers through the increased rateable value of the new buildings as compared with the old, *Rep.* vi——Benefit to the ratepayers in future by the improved health and morals of the people, *ib.*

See also *Compensation. Cost. Metropolitan Board of Works.*

Rayner, Joseph. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is Town Clerk of Liverpool; has been for the last twenty years engaged in carrying out sanitary works and street improvements under local Acts and Provisional Orders, 3438–3445.

Information respecting the only scheme which has been undertaken in Liverpool under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; application made to the Local Government Board for a modification of the original scheme, which could not be carried out through inability to find a purchaser for the ground, 3446–3453. 3475–3485. 3523–3532——Statement as to the estimated cost of the new street across Nash-grove; satisfactory result in so far as the actual expenditure amounted only to half of the estimate, 3451–3453. 3495–3502——

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Rayner, Joseph. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Rapidity with which the scheme of the new street was carried out under the Artizans' Dwelling Act of 1875; belief that it would have taken from two to three years to complete if the property had been taken under the Land Clauses Act, 3452-3456——Reasons for preferring the machinery of the Act of 1875 to the ordinary process under the Land Clauses Act, 3455, 3456.

Satisfactory manner in which the arbitration in regard to the value of the property purchased for the new street was carried out by Sir Henry Hunt; single case of appeal against his decision, 3455. 3457-3474. 3507-3515. 3602-3607——Expediency of trade compensation in the case of a person who loses his business through compulsory purchase of property, 3473, 3474——Statement that the general process of building in Liverpool provided ample accommodation for the people who had been displaced by the new street; no necessity, for this reason, for the Corporation to make any efforts to provide habitations, 3485-3492. 3567. 3573. 3577. 3598-3601. 3617——Proposal made for the erection of a fish market on the ground which the Liverpool Corporation have been unable to sell, 3494. 3608-3614.

Suggestions in regard to improvements in the existing Act with reference to assessing compensation for compulsory sales; improvement of the remaining property taken into consideration in the assessment of the compensation, 3503-3515. 3554-3566. 3615-3616 —— Belief that if the machinery under the Act were applied as suggested by witness, the compensation to be paid would be reduced by more than 25 per cent., 3508——The numbers to be displaced under the Nash-grove scheme would be about 200 families consisting of 1,100 persons, 3516-3518.

Local powers in Liverpool under the Sanitary Amendment Act of 1864 of dealing with premises which are unfit for human habitation; 100,000 *l.* spent by the Liverpool Corporation in effecting improvements under this Act, 3533-3541. 3544-3553. 3580-3584. 3589-3592——Disapproval of adopting the American law known as the "betterment" clauses, by which the whole cost of improvements is charged upon the other owners, 3559-3564. 3587, 3588——Liberal treatment by Sir Henry Hunt of the weekly tenants who were displaced by the new street, 3574.

Explanation that in Liverpool there is more overcrowding of houses than there is overcrowding of families in each house, 3575, 3576——Absence of inconvenience to the working men in Liverpool in being removed from the vicinity of their work, 3576, 3577 ——Compensation granted by Sir Henry Hunt in the case of insanitary dwellings which have to be pulled down to the extent of twelve years' purchase on the net rental, 3585, 3586.

Non-success of the building scheme entered into by the Liverpool Corporation under the Act of 1868; 3593-3597——Absence of any dissatisfaction in Liverpool through Sir Henry Hunt, a London man, having been appointed as arbitrator, 3603-3607——Facility of removing the artizans to places within a mile or so of Liverpool if it were necessary to displace them by demolishing insanitary dwellings, 3618-3620.

Re-building (Old Houses). Considerable attention paid by witness for seventeen years to the subject of housing the poor in London, her particular plan being the purchasing of old houses, and rebuilding them, *Miss Hill* 2977-2982——Decided opinion that rebuilding old houses can be made to pay as much as 4 per cent. on both ground and buildings, *ib.* 2983-2988——Tendency in Marylebone to rebuild houses for a slightly better class of people, and so to exclude those of the lowest class; disapproval of this tendency, *ib.* 3255-3258. 3301——Method adopted by witness in dealing with the tenants of houses which are demolished before being rebuilt; long notice given to the tenants, if possible, *ib.* 3311-3313.

Regent's Canal Bill. Clauses to be inserted in this Bill similar to those in force in the case of the Great Eastern Railway Company as regards workmen's trains, *Rep.* x.

Re-housing of Artizans and Labourers. See *Displacement and Replacement of Population.*

Reid, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Long and extensive experience of witness as a surveyor in London: he has often been consulted by the Metropolitan Board, 790–795 Frequent employment of witness in arbitration cases under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts 796.

Necessity of very heavy cost being incurred by the Metropolitan Board in the clearance of densely covered sites under the Acts; wide range of cost of the six sites purchased by the Peabody Trustees, 797——Enhanced outlay involved where it is necessary to acquire sanitary property in order to complete the schemes, 798–800——Serious depreciation in the value of the sites, through the obligation as to the erection of artizans' dwellings; obstacle to subsequent conversion into commercial purposes, 801, 802. 811-813.

Opinion that the price of 3 *d.* per foot, as paid by the Peabody Trustees, is as fair and reasonable an average for the whole of the six sites as could be obtained under the circumstances,

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Reid, Robert. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

circumstances, 803——Suggestion that the best mode of dealing with the people displaced by the clearance or any area is to give them a small money compensation, leaving them to find accommodation elsewhere, which they can readily do, there being plenty of empty houses, 804. 816-821. 857——Circumstance of the Peabody Buildings or other improved dwellings not being really available for the inhabitants of the slums, 805. 839.

Impracticability of purchasing any extensive areas within a couple of miles of Charing Cross as sites for artizans' dwellings; facility in obtaining sites within a radius of five miles or so, 806-808. 814, 815——Approval of the conditions and restrictions under which the land has been sold to the Peabody Trustees, 809, 810——Advantage of the working classes living in the suburbs and having cheap facilities of transit by railway and tramway; increasing numbers in the suburbs, 815. 824, 825. 929-934.

Means of removing the slums in the metropolis by applying Mr. Torrens' Acts, 822, 823——Information as to the character of the smaller houses and the density of the population in some of the suburbs and in several places outside the more central parts of the metropolis; reference especially to Camberwell and Somers Town, 823-834. 874-877.

Proposition that the Metropolitan Board, or some specially appointed authority, should exercise a supervision over all houses let in lodgings to weekly tenants with a view to compelling the owners to keep them in proper sanitary repair, and to make the accommodation otherwise suitable, 835-847——Very high rents extracted from the occupiers of large numbers of wretched tenements, seven or eight persons often occupying a single room, 838, 839. 847-851——Illustration in the case of houses in Newport Market of exorbitant rents and wretched accommodation, 851.

Expediency of many of the people displaced by the removal of slums being re-housed in the same vicinity in order to be near their work; advantage on the other hand in large numbers removing to the suburbs to more comfortable lodgings, 852-857. 874-882——Question considered as to the conditions of sale first imposed by the Metropolitan Board having been fair and reasonable, as well as the altered conditions applied in the case of the Peabody Trustees, 858-873——Result of witness' experience that the Artizans' Dwellings Acts can only be carried out at great expense to the ratepayers, and that the people displaced by the removal of slums might be left to provide for themselves, a few pounds being given in each case on removal, 880-889. 898. 904, 905.

Suggestion that the expense of working the Acts of 1875 and 1879 might be reduced by abolishing the provisional and final awards, 890——Proposal as regards compensation, that the property to be taken be classified into three divisions, *ib.*

Statement as to the prejudicial effect upon the value of cleared areas under the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act of 1872 by the obligation to allocate them in perpetuity as sites for labourers' dwellings, 891-894——Prejudicial effect also of the arbitration clause of the Street Improvements Act of 1872; 893.

Examination in support of the conclusion that the Metropolitan Board are unduly fettered by the 33rd section of the Street Improvements Act of 1877, and are prevented thereby from carrying out their Western-street improvements; suggestions for modifying the restrictions in question, 895. 935-948 *et seq.*——Proposed adoption of a clause similar to that in the Metropolitan District Railway Act of 1881, enabling the Metropolitan Board to make agreements with people about to be displaced, instead of procuring accommodation for them elsewhere, 898, 899. 910-913. 935-948.

Expediency of large sites, when cleared, being sold for commercial purposes, instead of being partly reserved for artizans, other and smaller sites elsewhere being procured for the latter, 900-905——Consideration of the question whether the people displaced from the district about Baldwin's-gardens could conveniently remove to a distance or to the suburbs; great facility if there were penny railway fares from and to the suburbs for these people, 914-934.

RENTS:

Very high rents extracted from the occupiers of large numbers of wretched tenements, seven or eight persons often occupying a single room, *Reid* 838, 839. 845-851——Advantage of the labouring classes living in the suburbs, as for the rent of one room in London they can get two rooms out of London, *Walker* 1048-1053——Increased rents since the Peabody Buildings and model lodging-houses have come into operation, *Gilbert* 1189-1191. 1211. 1370-1372——Indirect reduction of rent per room by sub-letting and by taking in lodgers; disapproval of this practice, on moral grounds, if it can possibly be avoided, *ib.* 1257-1277.

Importance of cheaper rents than in the Peabody Buildings; approval of simple and rougher accommodation so long as cheapness is secured, *Gilbert* 1365-1377. 1385-1387——Question considered as to the connection between low rents and low wages; doubt as to sackmakers and others being worse paid if their rents were lower, *ib.* 1378-1384.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

RENTS—continued.

Considerable rise in the price of lodging outside the model buildings on account of the general overcrowding, *Keating* 2103——Objection to the improved dwellings inasmuch as the rents demanded represent a proportion of from 25 to 28 per cent. on the earnings of the working classes, whereas outside the proportion is only 20 per cent., *Powell* 2491. 2528, 2529.

Opinion roughly that the general difference in rent between town and country is that 5 *s.* 6 *d.* will obtain in the suburbs what will cost 8 *s.* 6 *d.* in London, *Miss Stanley* 2878. 2883–2885. 2902——The usual rent for single rooms in witness' district is 3 *s.* a week, *ib.* 2902——Statement as to the amount of rent paid respectively for single rooms and for nightly lodgings in Whitechapel, *Barnett* 3023–3030.

Regular payment of rent by the tenants who live in witness' houses; strong feeling in favour of introducing a system of bonus for punctual payment of rent, *Miss Hill* 3394–3400.

Statement showing the weekly rents paid by tenants affected by the Sun-street to Worship-street improvement, *App.* 208–213.

Paper handed in by Miss Stanley showing the actual receipts and disbursements of three houses situated respectively in Lichfield-street, Market-street, and Porter-street, *App.* 220, 221.

Importance attached in memorandum by Professor Bryce to the system at Brooklyn (United States), of allowing discount on rents paid in advance, *App.* 237.

Replacement of Population. See *Displacement and Replacement, &c.*

Rose, The Rev. John. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Has been connected with the parish church of Clerkenwell for the last fourteen years; is well acquainted with the habits and occupations of the people in that district, 2389–2395.

Considerable overcrowding which has been caused in Clerkenwell by the demolition of houses in neighbouring parishes, 2394. 2427–2429——Great importance to the majority of the working men in Clerkenwell in being able to live in the neighbourhood of their work; certain class of workmen who could live outside as well as in the parish, 2396–2402. 2407–2410. 2416–2418. 2431–2438. 2449–2459——Considerable rise in rents in Clerkenwell within the last ten years; opinion that this is partly owing to the demolition of houses, and also to the increased population, 2403. 2444–2448——Demolition of houses for the purposes of the new street, 2411–2414.

Belief that there would be no advantage, on the score of health, in the working men going to the suburbs, as Clerkenwell is quite as healthy as the suburban parishes, 2419, 2420——Demoralization which naturally comes with overcrowding of families in one or two rooms, 2421–2426——Impossibility for men earning only 1 *l.* per week to live in the suburbs, notwithstanding the facility which exists in the communications by rail and tram, 2440–2443. 2458, 2459.

Instances of houses in Clerkenwell built originally to accommodate but one family, in which there are now six or seven families living, 2456——Objections made by people to the rules of the industrial dwellings when they first read them; contented character of the people when they come to live in them, 2460–2463——The only objection to these dwellings is that the rents are too high for men with small wages and large families, 2464, 2465.

S.

Sackmakers. Large displacement of sackmakers at Tower-hill and Rosemary-lane; non-admission of this class to the Peabody Buildings, *Gilbert* 1183. 1231. 1236. 1251——Importance of sackmakers living in the neighbourhood of the docks, *ib.* 1378–1381.

St. George-the-Martyr (Southwark). Progress made with this scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148——Statement showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Sanitary Arrangements. Statement in regard to the sanitary defects in the block system of dwellings; approval of stringent supervision on this point, *Powell* 2491. 2555-2558——Suggestions with a view to preventing the existing class of small houses from becoming insanitary and getting into a filthy state; necessity of strict sanitary regulations for new houses, *Barnett* 3177-3180.

Expediency of an official inspection in order to prevent houses getting into an insanitary state; belief that in London the sanitary Acts are sufficient if properly administered, *Miss Hill* 3232, 3233.

Recommendation that all existing sanitary legislation should be more fully enforced, *Rep.* x.

Savings (*Working Classes*). Information respecting a certain savings fund of which witness is secretary; scheme suggested by the churchwarden of St. Matthew's, City-road, by which working men may devote their savings to the building of model dwellings, and so become their own landlords, *Hodson* 2657-2667. 2701——Admission that if working men are of a saving disposition they can save in the country as well as in town, *Evans* 2815, 2816.

Schemes (*Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879). Total of fourteen schemes taken in hand by the Metropolitan Board, of which the larger portion has been thoroughly dealt with, and the land is fit for building upon; particulars hereon, *Goddard* 146-149.

Proposition that as Parliament, by the Act of 1875, amended by the Act of 1879, has sanctioned the principle of clearing away plague spots and unhealthy districts, any objections to schemes will be sufficiently considered by the confirming authority, or may be settled by some other ready means without the necessity of an application to Parliament in each case, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 192-198——Simplification of procedure and reduction of loss if the foregoing proposal be adopted, *ib.* 192-198. 327, 328.

Explanation that the simplified procedure suggested by witness is taken from the Post Office (Land) Act of 1881, except that in the latter case the Provisional Order has to be confirmed by Act of Parliament; delay and expense on the latter score, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 192. 195-197——Sufficiency of nine or ten months for the completion of schemes, up to the publication of the final award, if confirmation by Parliament be dispensed with; about two years are now necessary, *ib.* 214, 215.

Promotion of more schemes by the Metropolitan Board if freed from the restrictions on the sale of the land, *Goddard* 667, 668.

See also *City of London. Clerkenwell. Compensation. Cost. Displacement and Replacement of Population. Goulston-street and Flower and Dean-street. Gray's Inn-road. Metropolitan Board of Works. Sites. Southwark and Great Dover-street Scheme. Western Improvements Scheme.*

School Board for London. Practice of the London School Board to give the people displaced a short notice, and to compensate them, through their surveyor, the sums varying from 1 *l.* upwards; readiness with which the people remove, *Walker* 993-997.

Sewers (*City of London*), *Commissioners of.* See *City of London.*

Shops. Obstacle as a rule to the use of the upper floors of new buildings for artizans' dwellings, and of the lower floor for shops; facility in some cases, *Goddard* 1705, 1706. 1729-1731——Approval of shops in the ground floor of the new buildings, *Miss Hill,* 3419-3421.

Suggestion by the Committee that in many cases the lower storey may well be devoted to shops, with convenient rooms attached on the next storey, or elsewhere, for the accommodation of those who keep the shops, *Rep.* x.

Single Rooms. Great importance of having single rooms in the improved buildings; statement that in the Drury-lane improvements, out of tenements for 345 families there are but thirty single rooms, *Miss Stanley* 2852, 2853——Expediency of a large number of single rooms to accommodate the lowest class of the poor who have been removed from the damp underground cellars; suggestions as to the mode of construction, *Miss Hill* 3002-3005——Great necessity for more single rooms in the industrial buildings; difficulty of getting the extreme poor into the dwellings on account of the want of single rooms, *ib.* 3260. 3412. 3426-3430.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

SITES (IMPROVED DWELLINGS):

1. *Increased Value of the Areas or Sites acquired by the Metropolitan Board under Improvement Schemes, if they could be made available for Commercial Purposes.*
2. *Difficulties in the acquisition of Alternative Sites in London for the purpose of Artizans' Dwellings.*
3. *Particulars relative to the several Sites hitherto acquired, the Area, Cost, &c.*

1. *Increased Value of the Areas or Sites acquired by the Metropolitan Board under Improvement Schemes, if they could be made available for Commercial Purposes:*

Avoidance of great loss if the land acquired by the Board could have been used for commercial purposes, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 227 ——Greatly enhanced value if the sites could be sold for commercial purposes; in such case the operations of the Board would result almost in a profit, *Goddard* 550–554.

Serious depreciation in the value of the sites through the obligation as to the erection of artizans' dwellings; obstacle to subsequent conversion into commercial purposes, *Reid* 801, 802. 811–813——Expediency of large sites, when cleared, being sold for commercial purposes, instead of being partly reserved for artizans, other and smaller sites elsewhere being procured for the latter, *ib.* 900–905.

Opinion that in some cases the areas cleared should be let for commercial purposes, rather than for improved dwellings for the labouring classes, *Walker* 959, 960 ——Limited demand for sites if it were a condition that they must be devoted in perpetuity to artizans' dwellings; the price of 3 *d.* a foot, as given by the Peabody trustees, is in fact as much as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances, *ib.* 961, 962——Great saving if portion of the cleared sites could be sold by the Metropolitan Board for commercial purposes, *ib.* 1085, 1086. 1107–1109.

Absence of power in the Board to let under the full market value any vacant building sites not devoted by Act of Parliament to the erection of artizans' dwellings, *Goddard* 1615——Desire of the Board to provide accommodation in the cleared sites wherever the land is not commercially valuable, *ib.* 1622, 1623.

2. *Difficulties in the acquisition of Alternative Sites in London for the purpose of Artizans' Dwellings:*

Efforts made by the Board and its officers under the Amending Act of 1879 with a view to the acquisition of alternative sites within a three-mile radius of the cleared areas; extreme difficulty in procuring any eligible sites, *Goddard* 155–158. 564–566 —— Circumstance of the Board not having applied for relaxation under the 4th section of the Act of 1879, on account of the difficulty of acquiring new sites within a short distance of the cleared areas, *ib.* 693–695.

Impracticability of purchasing any extensive areas within a couple of miles of Charing Cross as sites for artizans' dwellings; facility in obtaining sites within a radius of five miles or so, *Reid* 806–808. 814, 815——Obstacle to the Board acquiring areas in the metropolis for labourers' dwellings without compulsory powers, *Walker* 965——Very few open spaces obtainable for the purpose in or near the centre of the metropolis, *ib.* 966.

Recent period at which witness was unable by advertising for the Metropolitan Board to obtain sites at a reasonable rate within three miles of St. Paul's; facility in obtaining sites within a circuit of five miles, *Walker* 1010–1016. 1087–1094——Higher rate which companies could afford to pay for sites for artizans' dwellings in the centre of London than in the suburbs; better demand in the former case through the people being nearer their work, *ib.* 1095–1101.

Further statement as to the difficulty experienced by the Metropolitan Board in acquiring sites in proximity to improvement schemes, though it is represented to witness that several large employers have succeeded in doing so, *Goddard* 1609. 1652. 1658–1671—— Greater difficulty of the Board than of private individuals in acquiring sites on reasonable terms, *ib.* 1669–1671——Instance in which substitution of one site for another was permitted by the Home Secretary, *ib.* 3736–3741.

3. *Particulars relative to the several Sites hitherto acquired, the Area, Cost, &c.:*

Paper submitted by Mr. Grant showing, for each scheme, the total area taken, and the total area to be sold, *App.* 204.

Tabular statement containing particulars relative to sites reserved by the Metropolitan Board for the erection of labourers' dwellings, under Section 49 of the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act of 1872, and showing the offers received for the several sites, *App.* 214, 215.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

SITES (IMPROVED DWELLNIGS)—continued.

3. *Particulars relative to the several Sites, &c.*—continued.

Reference by the Committee to the extent of the areas already dealt with, and the cost incurred in respect thereof, *Rep.* v.

See also *Acts of* 1875 *and* 1879. *City of London. Clerkenwell. Compensation. Conditions of Sale or Lease. Cost. Displacement and Replacement of Population. Gray's Inn-road. Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts. Newport Market. Peabody Trust. Suburbs. Southwark and Great Dover-street Scheme.*

Slums. See *Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses.*

Soho. Great difficulty in getting rooms in Soho, especially in the case of men with families, *Kirkham* 2210–2212. 2256-2260——Increased rents in Soho at the present time, caused by the overcrowding consequent on the houses being pulled down, *ib.* 2210–2212——The lodging-houses are more overcrowded at the present time, and the rents are higher than was the case ten or a dozen years ago, *ib.* 2254.

Low class of labourers who inhabit Crown-street; superior class of artizans in Old Compton-street, *Field* 2278-2285——Overcrowding in the neighbourhood by reason of the demolition in Bedfordbury and Wild-street, *ib.* 2286, 2287——Insanitary state of Crown-place at the present time; entire absence of inspection by the medical officer of the district, *ib.* 2287. 2317-2325. 2352, 2353——Increase of rents in Chapel-place and Crown-street on account of the overcrowding, *ib.* 2287.

Importance for witness to live in the quarter he is in at the present time on account of the character of his labour, it being essential that he should be near his work, *Field* 2313-2316.

Southwark and Great Dover-street Scheme. Great importance of the proposed Southwark and Great Dover-street communication, it being intended to devote the main portion of the property to artizans' dwellings; exceedingly low class of houses to be removed in this case, *Goddard* 1610, 1611——Necessity in order to carry out the foregoing improvement effectually, of the Metropolitan Board being relieved from the obligation as to not taking down more than fifteen houses, *ib.* 1611, 1612——Displacement of 1,622 persons by the Southwark and Great Dover-street Scheme, for all of whom accommodation is to be provided, *ib.* 1617, 1618.

Further statement as to the low and bad class of occupiers to be displaced by the Southwark and Great Dover-street Scheme; expediency of their being provided with improved lodgings in the same locality. *Goddard* 1724–1729——Advantage in this case of the proposal for the use of the ground floor for shops, whilst the upper floors might be used for artizans' dwellings, *ib.* 1729–1731.

Further information respecting the Great Dover-street to Southwark Bridge communication; importance in this scheme of having power to make the lower storeys into shops, *Goddard* 3714–3735——Belief that this scheme could be carried out in a year and-a-half if the required relaxation in regard to shops is granted by Parliament, *ib.* 3729–3734.

Southwark (St. George the-Martyr). See *St. George-the-Martyr.*

Stanley, The Hon. Maude. (Analysis of her Evidence.)—Witness, who resides in Dover-street, has taken great interest in the question of dwellings for the working people of London; she is well acquainted with the particular neighbourhood affected by the Western improvement, 2838, 2839.

Statement as to the inaccuracy of the calculation made by the Metropolitan Board of Works in regard to the number of persons to be displaced by the Western improvement, 2839, 2840. 2971–2976——Decided opinion that the working people should be re-housed in the same neighbourhood on account of their work; large expense which going to the suburbs entails upon the working man, 2841–2847. 2860–2865. 2869–2877. 2903–2906. 2927–2931——Great objection against going to the suburbs, that the children are not kept at home; danger to girls in coming back to the suburbs late at night from their work in town by the working men's trains, 2841, 2842. 2860–2865——Large numbers of workmen employed in trades which make it necessary that they should live near their work, 2844–2846. 2960–2962.

Immense overcrowding which the late demolitions have caused in the neighbourhood of the Western improvement, 2848–2850——Expediency of proceeding with the Western improvements by sections rather than doing it altogether, 2849, 2850——Approval of a modification of the restrictions imposed by the 23rd clause of the Act of 1877, in regard to the demolition of not more than fifteen houses, 2846. 2858. 2964–2970.

Great advantage to the working men of the model dwellings which have been lately built; there are a few restrictions which are disliked only by those persons who have had no experience of them, 2851–2853. 2866–2868. 2912–2915——Disadvantage in the

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Stanley, The Hon. Maude. (Analysis of her Evidence)—*continued.*

Peabody Buildings that there are no playgrounds for the children, 2852——Great importance of having single rooms in these buildings; statement that in the Drury-lane improvements, out of tenements for 345 families, there are but thirty single rooms, 2852, 2853——Entire want of accommodation for costermongers in the new buildings in the way of standing room for their trucks, or store-rooms for their goods, 2853.

Absence of any empty houses in London at the present time in which artizans could live, 2854——Large numbers of empty houses in the suburbs into which artizans will not go on account of the expense, 2855, 2856——Strong approval of the working of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; belief that if properly carried out the condition of the working people will be improved both socially and morally, 2857.

Large increase in the value of property where model dwellings have been erected; the rateable value of the property in Bethnal Green has increased as much as five-fold, 2859. 2916-2926——Strong disapproval of giving money compensation to the persons displaced under these Acts, 2869——Opinion roughly that the general difference in rent between town and country is that 5*s.* 6*d.* will obtain in the suburbs what will cost 8*s.* 6*d.* in London, 2878. 2883–2885. 2902——Impossibility of doing lasting good to the working people by small efforts of private individuals; what will really benefit them must be done by a great Act of Parliament, 2879–2882. 2887–2897. 2907–2911.

Information in detail as to some property owned by witness in the neighbourhood of the Western improvement, the rents, outgoings, state of repairs, &c.; paper proposed to be put in showing the names of the tenants and the rents paid by each, 2907–2910. 2932-2959——Explanation as to the rent and outgoings in the case of certain houses in Porter-street, Lichfield-street, and Market-street, 2933–2948.

[Second Examination.]—Further explanation with reference to the property owned by witness in the neighbourhood of the Western improvement; the actual rental received for the house, No. 5, Porter-street, has been 83 *l.*, out of which expenses to the amount of 65 *l.*, and rent collecting at five per cent. have to be deducted, 3006, 3007.

State Aid (*Artizans' Dwellings*). Decided opinion that the State should acquire lands compulsorily, if necessary, for the purposes of the Act of 1875; unfairness of the cost of the dwellings falling entirely upon the locality, *Powell* 2491. 2493–2496. 2536–2541. 2549–2560. 2572–2574——Strong desire felt by the working classes that the State should assist those who take up the matter of the artizans' dwellings by enabling them easily to acquire the land; advantage of this assistance, *ib.* 2549-2554.

Street Improvements. Aggregate of 130,906 *l.* as the value of the land thrown into public streets in respect of the schemes taken up by the Metropolitan Board under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, *Goddard* 542, 543——General average loss of 75 per cent. upon street improvements effected by the Board, *ib.* 654, 655.

Statements showing for each scheme, the cost of roads or streets, and sewers, *App.* 199. 204.

See also *Metropolitan Street Improvements Acts.*

Stroud Vale Buildings. See *Victoria Dwellings Association* (*Limited*).

Sub-letting. System adopted by witness in charging rents to her tenants, so that there may be no temptation to sub-let, *Miss Hill* 3422–3445.

SUBURBS:

1. *Conflicting Evidence on the Question as to the Desire of Working Men to live in the Suburbs rather than in London, and as to the Advantage of their doing so.*
2. *Extent and Character of the Accommodation in the Suburbs for the Working Classes; Expediency of strict Sanitary Regulations.*

1. *Conflicting Evidence on the Question as to the Desire of Working Men to live in the Suburbs rather than in London, and as to the Advantage of their doing so:*

Conclusion as the desire of the working classes to live in the suburbs if there were cheap railway facilities, *Goddard* 619–625——Advantage of the working classes living in the suburbs and having cheap facilities of transit by railway and tramway; increasing numbers in the suburbs, *Reid* 815. 824, 825. 929–934.

Several objections to the labouring classes of the metropolis living in the suburbs and travelling to and from their work by railway, *Gilbert* 1188 — Loss of time and social disadvantage where men have to travel any distance to and from their work, and are separated from their families throughout the day, *ib.*——Advantage, doubtless, in each family having two rooms instead of one; great disadvantages on the other hand by living in the suburbs; if otherwise, the working classes cannot pay for two rooms,

Gilbert

Report, 1882—*continued.*

SUBURBS—continued.

1. *Conflicting Evidence on the Question, &c.*—continued.

Gilbert 1212–1220——Belief as to the decided preference of labouring men to live in London, *ib.* 1213–1220.

Loss of the society of friends, and loss of amusements, by removal from London, *Gilbert* 1248, 1249——Desire of a large number of those who have been driven into the suburbs to come back into London if there were suitable accommodation for them, *ib.* 1328——Preference of the people for their present homes, as compared with improved sanitary dwellings, or with residence in the suburbs at a distance from their work; several grounds for such preference, *ib.* 1352–1364.

Apparent preference of workmen for residence in the suburbs, the number of such passengers on the Great Eastern line being constantly on the increase, *Birt* 1539–1548 —— Decided advantage in preventing overcrowding in the centre of London, and in encouraging the erection of labourers' dwellings in the outskirts: better health thereby, *Tripe* 1952–1954. 1994–1997. 2011–2015.

Opinion that, on the score of health, there is not much advantage of living in the suburbs; belief that in many cases the advantage of sleeping in the fresh air is lost by having often to sit in wet clothes the whole of the day, *Keating* 2087–2090. 2127–2129 ——Circumstances under which witness went to reside at Battersea, but returned to town after four months; rents were lower than in London for the same accommodation, *Kirkham* 2197–2202. 2209–2213——The principal objection to residing in the suburbs is the impossibility for workmen to return home to meals, *ib.* 2204–2208——Impossibility for men with families and low wages to reside in the suburbs, *ib.* 2214. 2215. 2243–2248.

Belief that to remove to the suburbs would be highly inconvenient to most working men; reasons for this opinion, *Field* 2276, 2277. 2326–2328——Impossibility of keeping a home and family together if working men are obliged to live in the suburbs and come to their work in London, *ib.* 2331–2338——Impossibility for men earning only 1 *l.* per week to live in the suburbs, notwithstanding the facility which exists in the communications by rail or tram, *Rose* 2440–2443. 2458, 2459.

Considerable inconvenience which is caused to the working men generally by being forced to live in the suburbs; extra cost of living by reason of the distance from the markets, *Powell* 2472–2481. 2491, 2492. 2516–2518. 2520–2523——Disapproval of sending workmen to live in the suburbs if convenient houses can be erected on sites where the demolition has taken place; increased cost of living in the suburbs on account of the distance from a market, *Abrey* 2579–2584. 2601–2604. 2606, 2607. 2637–2648 ——Belief that there is not much ground for complaint in regard to the distance preventing a man from having his meals at home; it is the rule for working men to have their meals away from home, *ib.* 2605.

Numerous cases in which workmen have gone to live in the suburbs, and have been obliged to return to town again; enhanced cost of living in the country on account of the absence of markets, *Hodson* 2653, 2654. 2668–2670. 2704–2706——Inconvenience caused to the working men by being obliged to live in the suburbs; numerous instances of working men returning to town on account of the overcrowding and other drawbacks, *Evans* 2752–2755. 2757–2766. 2799–2801. 2826–2832——Injurious effect of driving people to the suburbs, and making them dependent on friendly and saving societies; belief that it increases pauperism and destroys the habits of thrift which the men would indulge in if they had comfortable homes in London, *Evans* 2760. 2802, 2803. 2815, 2816——Belief that the difficulty of procuring provisions in the country is an evil very generally felt, *ib.* 2828–2834.

Evidence in detail as to the inexpediency of working men, dispossessed of their houses in London, being obliged to go to the suburbs for accommodation, *Miss Stanley* 2841 *et seq.*——Great objection against going to the suburbs, that the children are not kept at home; danger to girls in coming back to the suburbs late at night from their work in town by the working men's trains, *ib.* 2841, 2842. 2860–2865——Desire on the part of people who have gone to the suburbs to come back into London, *Miss Hill* 2993–2995.

Large migration of the working classes to the suburbs, *Rep.* x.

2. *Extent and Character of the Accommodation in the Suburbs for the Working Classes; Expediency of strict Sanitary Regulations:*

Information as to the character of the smaller houses and the density of the population in some of the suburbs and in several places outside the more central parts of the metropolis; reference especially to Camberwell and Somers Town, *Reid* 823–834. 874–877——Considerable number of empty houses in suburban localities, *Walker* 963. 1020–1022——Cheaper and more healthy accommodation in the suburbs than in the more central parts of the metropolis; very large number of small houses (through over speculation in the building trade) now available in the outer ring of the metropolis, *ib.* 1018–1022. 1035–1037. 1047–1053.

Report, 1882—*continued.*

SUBURBS—continued.

2. *Extent and Character of the Accommodation, &c.*—continued.

Prejudicial effect of the erection of a large number of workmen's cottages in suburban localities, in so far as the better class of railway passengers are thereby excluded, *Birt* 1421. 1425. 1441–1446. 1507, 1508. 1550, 1551——Information as to the accommodation in the houses in the eastern suburbs where the workmen live; rent of about 7 *s.* a week for each cottage, usually accommodating two families, there being rooms for each family and one common room, *ib.* 1430–1437. 1447–1450. 1453, 1454——Exceptional instances of the cottages in the suburbs having gardens of any size, *ib.* 1495–1497. 1515, 1516——Further particulars relative to the aggregation of cottages in the eastern suburbs; doubt as to the efficiency of the sanitary arrangements, *ib.* 1507–1522.

Desirability of building the houses in the suburbs higher than they are, and so accommodating double the number of people, *Keating* 2120–2126——Suggestions in favour of erecting cottage homes in the suburbs within ten or twelve miles of Charing Cross; advantage of providing an equitable system of purchase to be grafted on the terms of tenancy, *Powell* 2491. 2493. 2507–2512——Strong opinion that the buildings erected in the suburbs by private persons are not properly surveyed; necessity for carrying out the Building Acts much more stringently in the suburbs, *Abrey* 2591. 2629–2932——In the suburbs the general condition of the houses is not better than in London, *Evans* 2826, 2827.

Desirability of suburban buildings for the increased population; opinion, however, that in the central part of London there will be as much need of house accommodation as ever, *Miss Hill* 2990–2992—— Unsatisfactory sanitary condition of many buildings erected in the suburbs, *ib.* 3233. 3352–3354.

Suggestion by the Committee that many of the sanitary provisions of the Metropolitan Building Acts be at once extended to the suburbs, under the control of the several local authorities, *Rep.* x——Recommended strict enforcement of existing sanitary legislation, especially in those parts of the suburbs where buildings are so rapidly springing up, *ib.*

See also *Clapton Park. Displacement and Replacement of Population. Empty Houses. Great Eastern Railway. Hackney. Plumstead. Walthamstow. Women and Children. Workmen's Trains.*

Sun-street to Worship-street Improvement. Statement showing that in the case of the Sun-street to Worship-street Improvement the people displaced went to different outskirts instead of remaining in the old neighbourhood, *Goddard* 613–615. 619–625. 658—Compensation given in sums from 1 *l.* to 4 *l.* to the people displaced by the Sun-street to Worship-street scheme; satisfaction of the people with this plan, whilst they moved into houses infinitely better than those pulled down, *ib.* 1636–1639.

Paper submitted by Mr. Goddard containing particulars of weekly tenants, lodgers' rents, &c., and place of rehabitation, *App.* 208-213.

T.

Taxation of Costs. See *Costs.*

Tooley-street. Alternative site sanctioned by the Home Secretary in lieu of the Tooley-street site; excess accommodation provided in this case, *Goddard* 1610.

TORRENS' ACTS:

Improvement if the initiative under Mr. Torrens' Acts were taken by the Metropolitan Board instead of by the vestries, the former doing all their work very well, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 224, 225——Beneficial operation of the Acts in empowering the local authorities to enforce the repair of bad property, *ib.* 332.

Means of removing the slums in the metropolis by applying Mr. Torrens' Acts, *Reid* 822, 823—— Exceedingly beneficial operation of Mr. Torrens' Acts in the Holborn district, *Gibbon* 1749. 1752–1756——Several amendments required in these Acts; expediency of some remuneration of the surveyor and officers who carry them out, *ib.* 1755.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that instead of going into a large scheme of demolition and reconstruction, the improvements required, as in Marylebone, should be carried out by degrees under Mr. Torrens' Act, *Miss Hill* 3263 *et seq.*; 3351. 3363–3368.

Summary by the Committee of the objects of the measure of 1867–81, as introduced by Mr. Torrens into Parliament, and of the chief provisions of the Act of 1868, and of the Amending

Report, 1882—continued.

TORRENS' ACTS—continued.

Amending Act of 1879, *Rep.* iii, iv——Chief points of difference between the Acts of 1868 and 1879, and the Artizans' Dwellings Acts of 1875 and 1879, *ib.* iv.

Opinion of the Committee that Mr. Torrens' Act and the Acts of 1875 and 1879 though proceeding upon different principles, are alike necessary and useful, *Rep.* v——Great value of the Act of 1868, though limited in its scope, *ib.* x——Very little action taken under the Amending Act of 1879, *ib.*

The Committee strongly urge upon vestries and district boards the necessity of putting the provisions of these Acts in force without further delay, *Rep.* xi.

Opinion of the Committee that the Acts may be materially improved in certain respects; suggestions for giving effect to the improvements proposed, *Rep.* xi——Inexpediency of confining the operation of the Acts to individual premises; extension suggested, *ib.*

Suggestion with a view to the Metropolitan Board taking action in certain cases under the 12th section of the Act of 1879, *Rep.* xi.

See also *Closing and Demolition of Insanitary Houses.* *Dilapidated and Insanitary Houses.* *Marylebone.*

Tottenham. Exceedingly bad construction of a number of small houses built at Tottenham about ten years ago; use of very inferior bricks and mortar, *Tripe* 1930–1935——Stringent sanitary regulations now enforced in Tottenham, *ib.* 1987–1993.

Tower Hill. Information relative to the occupations of the people removed from the Tower Hill locality; importance of these living for the most part close to their work, *Gilbert* 1183. 1188——Belief as to their being much overcrowding through local provision not having been made for those displaced at Tower Hill, *ib.* 1193, 1194.

Trade (*Compensation*). See *Compensation*, 3. 8.

Transit Facilities. Great importance of favouring in every way facilities of transit between the metropolis and its suburbs, *Rep.* x.

See also *Great Eastern Railway.* *Workmen's Trains.*

Tripe, Dr. John William. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness is President of the Society of Medical Officers of Health, and has been medical officer of health for the Hackney district for the last twenty-six years, 1903, 1904.

Erection of nearly 10,000 houses in Hackney in the last ten years, a large portion of these having been built for artizans, 1905–1908——Exceedingly bad character of a large number of houses at Hackney Wick, built before the operation of the Metropolitan Building Act of 1878; wretched materials used in construction, whilst the sanitary arrangements were exceedingly defective, 1909–1921. 2021–2025——Usual rent of 2 *s.* 6 *d.* per room in these houses; size of the rooms and number of tenants in proportion to the number of rooms, 1910, 1911. 2023–2025.

Very high death-rate in the small houses in Hackney Wick in 1877; reduction since that year owing to the sanitary improvements enforced by the local authorities, 1918–1920. 1955. 1994–1996——Wretched materials used also in some houses built since 1879 in the lower part of the Clapton Park Estate; liability of these houses to be flooded, there being no power in the local or metropolitan authority to interfere, 1922–1929. 1936–1940——Improvement if the Metropolitan Board had power over the plaster used, as they have in the matter of concrete floors, 1924, 1925. 1940–1941. 1966. 2016.

Exceedingly bad construction of a number of small houses built at Tottenham about ten years ago; use of very inferior bricks and mortar, 1930–1935——Constant improvements being effected at the instance of the Hackney Board of Works in the sanitary condition of the houses, 1941–1944——Considerable number of inferior houses built by members of building societies, 1945–1949.

Room in the Hackney district for a further large accession of the working classes, 1950, 1951. 1999——Decided advantage in preventing overcrowding in the centre of London, and in encouraging the erection of labourers' dwellings in the outskirts; better health thereby, 1952–1954. 1994–1997. 2011. 2015——Importance of cheap trains for workmen on the North London Railway and on all the Metropolitan lines, as well as on the Great Eastern, 1952. 1983–1986——Low death-rate for the whole of Hackney, notwithstanding the large number of artizans and of bad houses, 1954, 1955.

Obstacle to any interference with the occupation of defective or insanitary houses when first built; check now exercised through the local authorities as regards drainage, &c., 1956–1966. 1972——Distinct duties of the vestries and of the district surveyors in respect of drainage and buildings, respectively, 1958–1964. 2017–2020——Respects in which further checks and increased inspection are required under the Metropolitan Building Acts; expediency of efficient supervision by the Metropolitan Board of all

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Tripe, Dr. John William. (Analysis of Evidence)—*continued.*

structural works, concurrently with an increased number of district surveyors, 1967–1974. 2000–2010——Further check suggested as regards damp-proof courses; duty of the district surveyor in this respect, 1968. 2002–2004.

Valuable operation of the Act of 1879, though increased powers are necessary in the Metropolitan Board, 1975, 1976. 2000–2010. 2016——Large number of costermongers resident in Hackney; different markets whence they obtain supplies, 1977–1982——Stringent sanitary regulations now enforced in Tottenham, 1987–1993——Low class and unhealthy character of workpeople who came to Hackney Wick from crowded and unhealthy localities in the city, 1994–1997——Many of the people go a considerable distance to their work, 1997, 1998.

Tyndall's Buildings. Rejection, as insufficent, of a scheme formerly promoted by the Metropolitan Board for dealing with Tyndall's Buildings, *Goddard* 1708–1710.

U.

United States. Information submitted by Professor Bryce relative to the satisfactory results of the efforts made by benevolent persons in the United States, as at Brooklyn and Boston, to provide dwellings for the labouring poor on a commercial basis, *App.* 237——Beneficial working of the system at Brooklyn of allowing discount on rents paid in advance, *ib.*

V.

Vacant Accommodation. See *Empty Houses.*

Valuation of Property (Cleared Areas). See *Arbitration. Compensation.*

Vestries. See *Local Authorities.*

Victoria Dwellings Association. Information relative to the operation of the Victoria Dwellings Association, the number and class of tenants, rents paid, &c., *Sir H. A. Hunt* 247–255——Further particulars in connection with the buildings of the Victoria Dwellings Company (as at Stroud Vale), the rents charged, and the class of people who are occupiers. *ib.* 369–374.

List of the occupations of the tenants in the Battersea Buildings and in the Stroud Vale Buildings, *App.* 198.

W.

Walker, Samuel. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Considerable practice of witness as a Surveyor in the City of London; he has been frequently engaged in claims under the Artizans' Acts, having acted for and against the Metropolitan Board, 949–956.

Necessarily heavy cost in clearing sites densely covered with small and unhealthy tenements, 957——Increased cost where it is necessary to acquire sanitary property in order to re-house the population removed from the cleared areas, 958——Opinion that in some cases the areas cleared should be let for commercial purposes rather than for improved dwellings for the labouring classes, 959, 960.

Limited demand for sites if it were a condition that they must be devoted in perpetuity to artizans' dwellings; the price of 3 *d.* a foot, as given by the Peabody trustees, is in fact as much as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances, 961, 962——Suggestion that those whose dwellings have been cleared away should be compensated, it being left to them to suit themselves elsewhere, 963, 964. 1140, 1141——Reliance to be placed on private enterprise for providing the required accommodation, 963——Considerable number of empty houses in Peckham, Wandsworth, and other localities, 963. 1020–1022.

Impracticability of the Metropolitan Board acquiring areas in the metropolis for labourers' dwellings without compulsory powers, 965——Very few open spaces obtainable for the purpose in or near the centre of the metropolis, 966——Difficulty in providing for the number displaced, on account of the small houses being packed so close, 967——Approval of the form of tender for letting the Whitechapel area, the clauses and conditions not being unduly stringent, and not deterring persons from building, 968–974——Practice generally in the case of large building estates to put the lessees into the hands of the surveyor to the estate, 974.

Statement as to witness having, when in Mr. George Pownall's office, settled with all the weekly tenants on the site for the new Law Courts, 975, 976——Particulars relative to the mode of settling with these tenants, and the discretion exercised by witness in giving sums of from 1 *l.* to 10 *l.* as compensation after a week's notice, 977–983. 1023–1028——Total of 834 families displaced on this site, the sum paid by witness amounting to

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Walker, Samuel. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

to 3,249 *l.*; 979——Readiness with which the people removed without complaint; various parts of the metropolis to which they went, 980–985. 1025–1031. 1038, 1039. 1102–1106——List of the different trades of the persons displaced, 985–990.

Information relative to the occupations of tenants in Baldwin's-gardens, Gray's Inn; large proportion not employed locally, about two-fifths being so employed, 991. 1040–1044——Practice of the London School Board to give the people displaced a short notice, and to compensate them, through their surveyor, the sums varying from 1 *l.* upwards; readiness with which the people remove, 993–997.

Particulars as to the time taken in the removal of the tenants from the Law Courts' site; absence of hardship in this respect, the people readily finding accommodation elsewhere, 998–1009——Recent period at which witness was unable by advertising for the Metropolitan Board to obtain sites at a reasonable rate within three miles of St. Paul's; facility in obtaining sites within a circuit of five miles, 1010–1016. 1087–1094——Facility to residence within a five miles' circuit, if the railway companies were compelled to carry workmen at cheap fares, 1017.

Cheaper and more healthy accommodation in the suburbs than in the more central parts of the metropolis; very large number of unlet houses (through over speculation in the building trade) now available in the outer ring of the metropolis, 1018–1022. 1035–1037. 1047–1053——Average of not more than ten years' purchase, on the net rental realised by private sales of freehold property in narrow courts and alleys, 1032–1034. 1054–1064——Varying length of residence of the tenants removed from the Law Courts' site, 1045, 1046——Advantage of the labouring classes living in the suburbs, as for the rent of one room in London they can get two rooms out of London, 1048–1053——Increased outlay necessary beyond ten years' purchase for bad freehold property, where there are middlemen to be dealt with, 1057–1064.

Satisfactory character on the whole of the awards made under the Act of 1875; 1065, 1066——Opinion that the blot in the Act is that arbitrators and juries have not sufficiently taken into consideration the dilapidated state of the property, 1066–1069——Amendment contemplated in Clause 19 of the Act upon the foregoing point, 1070——Question also whether Clause 3 of Act of 1879 should not be amended, 1071, 1072.

Necessity where there are displacements on a large scale of providing accommodation in the locality for a portion of those displaced; average of about two-fifths locally employed, 1073–1077. 1110–1115——Importance of marketing facilities as an element for consideration in the clearance of any large area in the metropolis; several cheap markets all over the metropolis, 1078–1084——Great saving if portion of the cleared sites could be sold by the Metropolitan Board for commercial purposes, 1085, 1086. 1107–1109.

Exorbitant price which the Board must pay for sites in the centre of London, in the absence of compulsory powers, 1087–1094——Higher rate which companies could afford to pay for sites for artizans' dwellings in the centre of London than in the suburbs; better demand in the former case through the people being nearer their work, 1095–1101.

Expediency of the Act being modified by requiring that the accommodation to be provided locally should apply to only two-fifths of those displaced, 1113–1115. 1174–1178——Approval of the cleared sites being first offered to public companies by auction and of its being compulsory upon the Board to provide the new buildings if others do not come forward to do so, 1116–1120——Inexpediency of putting the Board in competition with private enterprise in the provision of improved dwellings, 1121–1123.

Correction of former statement as to the price realised by poor freehold property, the amount being fourteen or fifteen per cent., and being about ten per cent. for the leasehold, 1124, 1125.

Effect of certain provisions of the Metropolitan Street Improvements Act of 1872 in militating against the purchase of cleared sites for artizans' dwellings, 1126–1130——Way in which the 33rd section of the Metropolitan Street Improvement Act of 1877 renders impracticable the completion of certain improvements of the Board; that is, through the difficulty of obtaining sites within a reasonable distance, 1131–1139. 1142–1147——Reference especially to the wretched state of the Gray's Inn-lane improvement, through there being no sites available within a reasonable distance, 1132–1139.

Conclusion as to the expediency of repealing or modifying the 33rd section of the Act of 1877; 1133. 1142–1147. 1162–1173——Areas yet requiring to be dealt with, 1148——Default of the parish authorities owing to which the necessity for the Artizans' Dwellings Acts has mainly arisen, 1149.

Consideration of the question whether certain sites or frontages are not available within a reasonable distance of Gray's Inn-lane, the difficulty really being as to the cost; great sacrifice if these spaces were used for artizans' dwellings instead of for commercial

Report, 1882—*continued.*

Walker, Samuel. (Analysis of his Evidence)—*continued.*

purposes, 1150-1173——Further reference to the experience obtained in the case of Baldwin's-gardens, where about forty per cent. of the people are locally employed, 1174-1178.

Walthamstow (*Great Eastern Railway*). Details relative to the workmen's trains to and from Walthamstow, Edmonton, and other stations near London, *Birt* 1392 *et seq.*——Failure of an attempt to issue third-class season tickets from Walthamstow, *ib.* 1498, 1499.

Mischievous result of the congregation of large numbers of working people at Walthamstow; very bad class of houses erected in this locality, *Gibbon* 1757-1764.

Wapping. Facility to proceeding with the scheme near Wapping by a relaxation of the requirements as to the re-housing the entire number displaced, *Rep.* ix.

Warehouses. Disapproval of permitting large warehouses to be built in London whilst the working classes are driven out of the town by the demolition of their homes, *Evans* 2795-2798.

Weekly Tenants. See *Compensation*, 4. 8.

Wells-street (*Poplar*). Progress made with this scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 148.

Western Improvements Scheme:

Provision for the housing of 2,070 persons out of 5,497 affected by the improvements from Piccadilly to Bloomsbury, and from Charing Cross to Oxford-street; reduction feasible in the latter number, *Goddard* 1581-1595——Facilities in the foregoing case but for the requirement as to not removing more than fifteen houses at a time, *ib.* 1581-1595——The total of 5,497 includes artizans in every house scheduled within the limits of deviation, whereas it is not the intention to take all these houses, *ib.* 1595.

Statement as to the inaccuracy of the calculation made by the Metropolitan Board of Works in regard to the number of persons to be displaced by the Western Improvement, *Miss Stanley* 2839, 2840. 2971-2976——Expediency of proceeding with the Western Improvements by sections, rather than doing it altogether; great overcrowding in the latter case, *ib.* 2849, 2850.

Information in detail as to some property owned by witness in the neighbourhood of the Western Improvement; paper put in showing the names of the tenants and the rents paid by each, *Miss Stanley* 2907-2910. 2932-2959. 3006, 3007——Very bad state of repair of these houses; denial, however, that they are in an insanitary condition, witness having improved them, *ib.* 2907-2910. 2952-2958——Particulars relative to the rents and outgoings in respect of houses in Porter-street, Lichfield-street, and Market-street; the actual rental received for the house No. 5, Porter-street, has been 83 *l.*, out of which expenses to the amount of 65 *l.*, and rent collecting at five per cent., has to be deducted, *Miss Stanley* 2933-2948. 3006, 3007——In three years witness has spent 14 *l.* more than she has received from this house, *ib.* 3006.

Examination with further reference to the Western Improvements Scheme; pestiferous condition of the majority of the dwellings included in this scheme, *Goddard* 3675-3713——Proposal to substitute a site in Kentish Town for the rehabitation of the people displaced under this scheme; financial difficulty which will arise if the Board are compelled to devote the whole of the property to re-housing the working classes, *ib.* 3680-3693.

Desire on the part of the Board to limit the demolitions as nearly as may be to those houses required for making the new street; otherwise a greater number of persons will be disturbed than can be accommodated in the same area, *Goddard* 3709, 3710.

Plan submitted by Mr. Goddard explanatory of the Western Improvements Scheme, under the Streets Improvement Act of 1877, *App.* 236.

Liability of 5,300 persons to be displaced under the scheme for the Western Improvements, within the limits of deviation, *Rep.* xii——Proposal of the Metropolitan Board whereby the number liable to be displaced will be reduced to 4,000 *l.*, for one-half of whom accommodation is proposed to be provided, *ib.*——Approval by the Committee of the proposals of the Board; these should be carried out at once, the Board being first relieved of certain restrictions, *ib.*

Westminster. See *Old Pye Street.*

Whitechapel and Limehouse:

1. *Particulars in connection with the Arbitration in the Whitechapel Scheme.*
2. *Estimates and Cost.*
3. *Conditions of Sale or Lease of Land.*
4. *Other Particulars generally on various Points.*

1. *Particulars*

Report, 1882—*continued.*

WHITECHAPEL AND LIMEHOUSE—continued.

1. *Particulars in connection with the Arbitration in the Whitechapel Scheme:*

Occupation of about twelve months by the arbitration, &c., in the Whitechapel Scheme; delay of about three months in this case through the modification of the scheme, *Sir H. A. Hunt*, 186–188——Illustration in the case of the Whitechapel Scheme of the reduced compensation awarded in view of the dilapidated condition of the property; total of about 10 *s.* per foot awarded for land and houses in this instance, *ib.* 227.

Reference to the Whitechapel Scheme in illustration of the large excess of claims sent in as compared with the amount awarded by witness, *Sir H. A. Hunt* 426-429——Award of 93,300 *l.* in respect of 153,000 *l.* claimed in the Whitechapel case, the final award having been 130,000 *l.*, *ib.* 493–495.

In the Whitechapel Scheme the matter was left entirely to Sir Henry Hunt, as standing arbitrator, the Board not appealing in any case, *Goddard* 528, 529. 544, 545.

Statement showing for the Whitechapel and Limehouse Scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

2. *Estimates and Cost:*

Statement of the estimated cost of the land required under the Whitechapel and Limehouse Scheme, the estimate for roads and sewers, and the estimated recoupment, *Goddard* 510. 534——Estimated net cost of 54,400 *l.*, *ib.*

Statement showing the original estimate, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Return showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Particulars in Return submitted by Mr. Grant; comparison of outlay and estimated return, *App.* 204.

3. *Conditions of Sale or Lease of Land:*

Paper submitted showing the alteration in the original tender for the Whitechapel site, *Goddard* 583; *App.* 202——Approval of the form of tender for letting the Whitechapel area, the clauses and conditions not being unduly stringent, and not deterring persons from building, *Walker* 968-974.

Conditions of sale of land as regards approval of building plans, &c. by the Metropolitan Board, *App.* 202.

4. *Other Particulars generally on various Points:*

Progress made with the Whitechapel scheme, as on 1st March 1882, *Goddard* 146——Horrible condition of some of the courts and tenements comprised in this scheme; exceedingly small value put upon this property, *ib.* 511, 512. 516. 520-524.

Extremely low class of poor living in Whitechapel, street occupations being their chief mode of earning a living, *Barnett* 3002–3015——Strong reasons for the opinion that the poor in Whitechapel cannot afford to separate; remarkable manner in which they help each other when in want of work, *ib.* 3034–3036. 3115–3117.

Futile efforts made to improve the neighbourhood under Mr. Torrens' Acts before the passing of the Artizans' Dwellings Acts; disinclination of the vestry to do anything for the improvement of the dwellings as they had not power of giving compensation to the owners, *Barnett* 3040–3044. 3106–3110. 3150-3164. 3184–3186——Decided opinion that in the administration of the Acts of 1875 and 1879 re-construction should take place as rapidly as possible; demolition of houses of a fairly good character in George-yard, *ib.* 3045–3054. 3216.

Instance of excessive compensation awarded to owners for demolition of their property, *Barnett* 3062, 3063. 3181–3183——Large amount of good accomplished by voluntary efforts in Whitechapel in the purchase of property for improved dwellings; average of four per cent. paid upon the outlay upon these buildings, *ib.* 3064-3073. 3113, 3114——Absence of restrictive rules in the improved dwellings so long as the tenants are fairly decent livers; rents of these dwellings paid punctually as a rule, *ib.* 3074–3080——Paper handed in showing particulars of the tenants in Lord Pembroke's dwellings, and in other houses in Whitechapel, *Barnett* 3087–3096; *App.* 222, 223.

Numerous districts in Whitechapel scheduled under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, *Barnett* 3200–3202——Local interests which are chiefly affected in Whitechapel by the scheme for new buildings; the legislation having permitted the present state of things

Report, 1882--*continued.*

WHITECHAPEL AND LIMEHOUSE—continued.

4. *Other Particulars generally on various Points*—continued.

to grow up, ought to bear the cost, rather than the locality, *Barnett* 3203–3211——Benefit to the ratepayers by the erection of improved dwellings, *ib.* 3212–3215.

Explanation with reference to a block of dilapidated buildings which is omitted from the improvements contemplated under the Act of 1875, on account of being surrounded by shops in the High-street, *Barnett* 3227–3230.

See also *Goulston-street, and Flower and Dean-street.*

Whitecross-street (*St. Luke's*). Instance of excessive claims under the Whitecross-street scheme; reduction of one claim from 47,052 *l.* to 19,750 *l.*, *Goddard* 530.

Statement showing for this scheme the time occupied before the final award of Sir Henry Hunt, the number of cases decided, the number of appeals, the amount of the provisional award and of the final award, and the total expenses, *App.* 197.

Return showing the original estimates, the amount of settlement by the Metropolitan Board, and by arbitration, the cost of land, and the actual amount received for recoupment, *App.* 199.

Statement showing the total area taken, the gross cost per foot superficial, the area of recoupment, the estimated recoupment per foot superficial, and the per-centage on gross cost, *App.* 200.

Wolverhampton. See *Arbitration.*

Women and Children. Numerous instances in which the earnings of the men are supplemented by that of his wife and children in the neighbourhood of their homes; obstacle on this score to their removal to the suburbs, *Gilbert* 1237–1247. 1250——Great hardship in the case of widows with children, and upon single women driven from their work into the suburbs, and compelled to travel from a distance to their employment, *ib.* 1336–1340.

Little, if any, employment, in the suburbs for the women and children, *Birt* 1440——Strong disapproval of the wife having to go out to work as well as the husband, *Keating* 2146–2150——Great advantage to the children when the father goes home in the daytime to a regular meal, *ib.* 2160, 2161.

Workmen's Trains. Expediency of all railways being compelled to run workmen's trains as cheaply as the Great Eastern Company, *Goddard* 616–618——Facility to residence within a five-mile circuit, if the railway companies were compelled to carry workmen at cheap fares, *Walker* 1017——Loss of time and earnings when men are obliged to go to their work a long distance by railway, *Gilbert* 1360.

Use of workmen's trains by many of a higher class than that for which they were intended, *Birt* 1427–1429. 1457——Importance of cheap trains for workmen on the North London Railway, and on all the metropolitan lines, as well as on the Great Eastern, *Tripe* 1952. 1983–1986.

Decided opinion that workmen should be carried by the railway companies at a charge of 1 *s.* a week for any distance up to ten or twelve miles; belief that such arrangement would pay the companies, *Powell* 2513–2515. 2561–2568——The trains should begin to run at 5 a.m., and should run after 5 p.m. up to 8 p.m., *ib.* 2513–2515.

Recommendation that workmen's trains should run between five and eight o'clock in the morning, and that the fare should be no more than 1 *s.* a week, which should be made compulsory by Government, *Abrey* 2585–2587. 2597–2600. 2608, 2609. 2624–2626——Complaints in regard to the difficulty of getting to and from the suburbs by workmen's trains; temptation to working men to spend their money in public-houses while waiting for trains, *Evans* 2756–2759. 2766. 2777–2789. 2799–2801. 2817–2819.

Recommendation by the Committee that similar conditions as to workmen's trains within a certain distance from London to those now imposed on the Great Eastern Railway Company, should be enforced in the case of other railways as opportunities may offer, *Rep.* x.

See also *Great Eastern Railway.*